

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. XIV

Winter Number, 1944-1945

No. 1

EDITORIAL BOARD

NOLAN B. HARMON, JR., *Editor-in-Chief*

MAEANNA CHESERTON-MANGLE, *Assistant Editor*

JOHN BAILLIE

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

HOWARD C. ROBBINS

ROBBINS WOLCOTT

JAMES R. JOY

PAUL SCHERER

BARSTOW

KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT G. ASHTON OLDHAM

ADVISORY COUNCIL

John Keith Benton

John Alexander Mackay

Richard Roberts

Angus Dun

Earl Bowman Marlatt

D. Elton Trueblood

Paul Bentley Kern

Robert Hastings Nichols

Gregory Vlastos

W. E. McCulloch

Richard Campbell Raines

Leslie D. Weatherhead

Arthur Cushman

Luther D. Reed

Luther A. Weigle

McGiffert, Jr.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Coming Great Church.....	Theodore O. Wedel 3
New Testament and a Changing Liberalism.....	Clinton M. Cherry 14
James Moffatt, 1870-1944.....	Ernest Findlay Scott 24
On the Meaning of History.....	Karl Löwith 32
Translating Hymns for Other Tongues.....	Carl F. Price 40
What Can We Learn From the Cults?.....	Charles S. Braden 52
Educating the New England.....	Cecil Northcott 65
Present Trend.....	Taylor E. Miller 77
The Propaganda Problem of the Church.....	Lockhart Amerman 86
Treasure in Earthen Vessels.....	Millar Burrows 97
The Church and Returning Veterans.....	Chester A. Pennington 107
The Crux of Christian Ethics.....	Alban Gregory Widgery 112
How to Read Thomas Mann.....	Clarence Seidenspinner 122
Quest or Conquest?—A Review of the Quarter's Fiction,	Ralph W. Sockman 130
Book Reviews.....	138

Copyright, 1944, by Whitmore and Stone. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Published by

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

150 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

Who's Who?

LOCKHART AMERMAN, M.A., D.D. Minister, The Presbyterian Church, Sewickley, Pennsylvania.

CHARLES S. BRADEN, Ph.D., D.D. Professor of the History and Literature of Religions, The College of Liberal Arts, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

MILLAR BURROWS, Ph.D. Professor of Biblical Theology, The Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

CLINTON M. CHERRY, Th.D. Minister of the Methodist Church, Sharon Hill, Pennsylvania.

KARL LÖWITH, Ph.D. Visiting Professor in the Philosophy of Religion, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut.

TAYLOR E. MILLER, M.A. Lieutenant, Chaplain in the United States Naval Reserve, Fleet Post Office, New York, New York.

CECIL NORTHCOTT, M.A. Secretary of the London Missionary Society, London, England.

CHESTER A. PENNINGTON, B.D. Lieutenant, Chaplain, United States Naval Construction Battalion, Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, California.

CARL F. PRICE, M.A. First President, Hymn Society of America, New York, New York.

ERNEST FINDLAY SCOTT, D.D., LL.D. Professor Emeritus of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York.

CLARENCE SEIDENSPINNER, D.D. Minister, First Methodist Church, Racine, Wisconsin.

RALPH WASHINGTON SOCKMAN, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., L.H.D., Litt.D. Minister of the Christ (Methodist) Church, New York, New York.

THEODORE OTTO WEDEL, Ph.D., S.T.D. Canon of Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C.

ALBAN GREGORY WIDGERY, M.A. Professor of Philosophy, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press at 75 cents per copy. Annual subscription, \$3.00 per year in the United States and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents additional. For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by the Eyeworth Press, 25-26 City Road, London, E. C. 1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Publication office, 810 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee. Editorial and General offices, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York. Entered as Second Class Matter, January 18, 1932, at the post office in Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 18, 1948.

The Coming Great Church

THEODORE O. WEDEL

IN DECEMBER of the year 1938 there met, at Madras, India, a conference of the International Missionary Council. This, with the exception of the World Conference of Christian Youth the following summer, was the last world gathering of Christians before the outbreak of the Second World War—the last in a generation which had seen a whole series of similar ecumenical conferences. The thunder clouds of global conflict were already on the horizon. China and Japan had already seized the sword. A Methodist missionary present at this conference commented on it as follows:

“As we gathered at Madras, representatives of Christ’s Church from every land under the sun, some of us thought we heard our Lord saying, ‘Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see: for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see and saw them not.’¹ Yes, indeed, was ever a generation like ours? The universal nature of the Church, true as an ideal from the time of our Lord and His Apostles, we saw as no Christians in nineteen centuries have seen, worthily represented in the actual and the concrete. This also has happened in our lifetime. God is not mocked. The world is not left at the mercy of a madman. Present in God’s world, and never so widely established is God’s Church, the central point of His working, the instrument for the fulfillment of His purposes, already in itself a foretaste of the redeemed family of God which He has purposed humanity to be. The City of God remaineth. Lift up your hearts!”²

Now these are words, we must admit, of an enthusiast, thrilled as only a missionary can be, perhaps, over the miracle of geographical catholicity in our time. The Great Church is here—in space. The gospel has penetrated the farthest corners of our world just ahead of the aeroplane—a fact which may turn out to be a major event in world history. And this spread of Christianity has happened in our time.

The Great Church already here? Yes, in one sense. No Christian using the word “Church” from henceforth can wholly ignore the meaning

¹ Luke 10:23.

² John Foster, *Then and Now*, SCM, 1942, pp. 39-40.

which it can bear as describing a world-embracing community of believers in Christ as Lord. The commandment "Go ye into all the world" has been met. This far-flung community is awaking to self-consciousness. It is rediscovering itself as a mysterious act of God in history, the bearer of yet scarcely tested powers. The twentieth century is recapitulating the age of the apostles. Historians of missions speak commonly of the older and the younger churches. The younger churches are closer in outlook to the first century than to the sixteenth or even eighteenth. What does the age of religious wars or of Catholic-Protestant persecutions mean to them? They can understand, on the basis of the miracle of their own creation, the Epistles of Saint Paul. They can scarcely understand the literature of Christian schisms which still fashions the thinking of the older church groups.

Hence it is that from these younger churches comes a special cry to their mother churches for unity. Geographically the Christian body of believers may be catholic in the sense of external dispersion over our globe. But internally it is not catholic. It is not the Great Church. "By schisms rent asunder," yet by definition both one and holy, it testifies against its own message. We who live in the older regions of Christendom do not feel this tragic paradox as does the Church on the mission field. We are accustomed to seeing our twelve or more denominational church spires in every town, each proclaiming its own version of the Faith. Familiarity has robbed the sin of disunion of its shame. Yet the fact remains that "a divided Church belies its own Creed. It warns the world against its own gospel. Our thought still moves in a fatally false atmosphere. . We have come to regard as normal and inevitable that against which about half of the New Testament is a passionate and sustained appeal."³

I shall not, however, dwell now upon the obvious fact that Protestant Christianity is on its institutional side, the Church in fragments. An observer from the Catholic half of Christendom may find some excuse for predicting the eventual dissolution of Protestantism. What chance, so the Catholic would argue, has Protestantism in the coming era when it must confront institutional rivals of gigantic powers? The day of Protestant individualism is over. Secularism was once, too, individualistic and atomized. Protestant reliance upon Bible and individual conscience could, accordingly, maintain itself for a few centuries. But our world is

³ F. R. Barry, in *The Guardian*, June 28, 1929.

atomized no longer. Secularism is itself becoming corporate. Only Catholic Christianity can hope to main itself. This Catholic argument has, indeed, great force. Well may Protestantism heed it. However, the Catholic prophecy of coming victory may be a little premature. Let the Catholic observer observe again and more deeply. He may see, if he is wise, strange stirrings in that belittled Protestant world.

For Protestantism is beginning to speak again of the Great Church, the Catholic Church of Christian Creed and Christian Faith. If the age of individualism is truly receding in contemporary history, Protestant leadership is aware of this momentous fact. Contemporary history is forcing this fact upon our attention in unmistakable events. The Protestant churches—and here the Catholic is surely right—will have to turn about and become “catholic” or perish. The Protestant era as such may be over and a post-Protestant era emerging. And this new age will have to be “catholic.” The Church as a corporate, historical, social fact will have to be rediscovered. Such a rediscovery may, however, not be quite so difficult as an observer from the outside imagines. The Reformation tradition knows some things about the Church of which historic Catholicism itself is ignorant. The Reformation was a revolt against an authoritarian and tyrannical Church order. It was not a revolt against the doctrine of the Church. For a time at least a true people-Church appeared in history—a rediscovery of the *ecclesia* of the New Testament. I would agree with P. T. Forsyth, who writes as a Congregationalist, when he says, “The Reformation certainly made religion personal, but it did not make it individualist.”⁴

Nevertheless, it is true that for centuries the idea of the Great Church has been lost or minimized in the Protestant world. Subjective individualism has ruled in the place of loyalty to a corporate Church. Protestantism is confronted by the need to recover the doctrine of the Church in the form of a doctrine of the Great Church. This, as I see it, is today its most necessary task. One of the most eloquent and uncompromising apologies for Protestantism that I have ever read is an essay entitled *Historical Christianity*, by Alexander Vinet, a noted Swiss Reformed theologian writing a hundred years ago. I quote his frank judgment on this matter:

“The imperfection of the reforming work of the sixteenth century, depends upon the doctrine of the Church not having been thoroughly

⁴ P. T. Forsyth, *The Principle of Authority*. Hodder & Stoughton, 1912, p. 320.

gone into, or the ecclesiastical question definitely settled, when all other questions were so. This is the very point that the reformers, who could not do or see everything, have left to our care. No doubt a Church, where much is said about the Church, is not *for that reason* more vigorous or healthy; but a Church which does not realize the idea of Church, or care about realizing it, which does not even feel the need to do so, is not the most desirable Church either. Men did not separate for the sake of separating; separation was but a *medicine* that many have mistaken for *food*.”⁵

The strength of Protestantism, however, lies in its possessing a principle of life which can transcend itself. It broke the bonds of tradition once. It can break them again—this time the bonds which it forged for itself during its own reign in history. To return to a catholic idea of the Church will mean for Protestantism a supreme test of its conscience. When this idea is called “catholic,” this does not mean a return to the medieval Church—far less a submission to papal Rome. It may find its forms, indeed, in history. But it will also be a fresh creation of the Holy Spirit. That is why one may venture to speak of this rediscovered Catholicism by a new name. I call it here the “Great Church.” It is a phrase increasingly used.

The most obvious sign of the rediscovery of the Great Church is the ecumenical movement itself. No history of the ecumenical movement can be given here. It is scarcely a single generation old. One has to go back in Christian history hundreds of years, a thousand years, or even longer, to find real parallels to it. Here is the Christian family once more “gathered.” It is again a universal *ecclesia*, an assembly. To many modern Christians the very idea of catholicity has been utterly foreign—particularly if this idea carries with it the assumption that to be a Christian means, first of all, membership in a community. Is it exaggeration to say that most Protestants, if pressed, would have placed the idea of Church a distant second in comparison with the idea of personal commitment to Christ? The Church as a mighty commonwealth of God, universal, holy, with a majestic history, with divine sanctions of its own superseding those of any fractional grouping—such a concept is not vividly imagined.

A movement within Roman Catholicism itself should here be noted which also involves a rediscovery of the true New Testament Church.

⁵ Alexander Vinet, *Outlines of Theology*, English Translation, London, 1866, p. 423.

I refer to the Liturgical Movement. Its literature is already immense. It has evoked parallel movements in practically all the other churches of Christendom. To a Protestant, the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Church seems like the Reformation come again—this time within Rome itself. If the ecumenical rediscovery of the doctrine of the Church is driving Protestants to a re-evaluation of the historic Christian centuries, here is that ecumenical rediscovery in reverse. Pages on pages in the writings of the leaders in the movement read as if they were culled out of Luther or Calvin.

For the simple fact is that the concept and actuality of a people-Church has been lost in the Roman Church also. Despite the universality and uniformity of its sway over millions of Christians, a true sense of corporateness has been lost. Worship in the Roman Church as in Protestant churches has become individualistic. It is (I am paraphrasing Roman Catholic critics of their own Church) "devotional," not truly "liturgical." It has lost contact with common living. "The liturgical worship of the Western Church seems to have absolutely no points of contact with our daily life and the things that make it up." The leaders of the movement plead for the Mass in the vernacular, for masses celebrated in the afternoon or evening when people can come (a privilege already largely granted, though with disciplinary protections).

Since a full discussion of the genius of the Liturgical Movement cannot be given here, let a concrete quotation serve. I take this from an article by one of the leaders of the movement in Great Britain, Donald Atwater. The title is strangely evangelical, "The Breaking of Bread." The author begins with a lament over the gulf which has grown up between "Church" life and daily life. The externals of the Mass involve "a man in unfamiliar clothes, using unfamiliar gestures, speaking in an unknown tongue, and sometimes singing an unfamiliar sort of music." This unreality surrounding the sanctuary, the author continues, extends to the people's participation in the action. The very word "Mass"—what does it mean? Reviewing the many concrete names once in use for this service in Christendom (Offering, Eucharist, Liturgy, Holy Mysteries), he comes upon the simplest of them all—*Coena Domini*, the Lord's Supper. And then, referring in veiled, yet unmistakable terms, to the Protestant revolt, the writer makes his plea for a rediscovery, on the part of Catholicism, of the lost doctrine of the true Church—a doctrine which *he* is compelled to find preserved in Catholicism's historic rival!

"For the space of over three hundred years the pressure of heretical exaggeration in the opposite direction has caused us (Roman Catholics) to emphasize the Sacrifice at the expense of the Supper. And the Mass has in practice become a dual act: the priest at the altar doing one thing; the assembly of the faithful in the nave doing all sorts of other things—in general, each person following the devices of his own heart, oblivious of his neighbor, even, it may happen, forgetful of the altar, the table, Calvary.

"This is not what the Church intends. It is not what the Lord Christ intended when He said, 'Do this. . . .'"⁶

Here is but a brief glimpse into the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Church. Anyone familiar with the history of religious controversy of the past four hundred years must rub his eyes in amazement. The liturgy is not all of Christian life, but it is crucial. In the area of liturgical symbols the bitterest battles have been fought. The very words most familiar in the Protestant and Catholic liturgical traditions have become opposing war cries—Mass as over against Lord's Supper, surplice or chasuble as over against gown, sacrifice as over against communion. Can it be that this ancient field of strife may once more see a peace—a peace not of capitulation or empty compromise, but a peace resulting from a rediscovery of the corporate fellowship in Christ which alone gives the Church's liturgical life its meaning? For if the literature of the Romanist Liturgical Movement reads as if the Reformation had come alive again, the corresponding liturgical movements in Protestantism look as if the Reformation churches were rediscovering, in their turn, the forgotten centuries antedating the great revolt. Symbols out of the worship life of the early historic Church are reappearing once more—altars and vestments, candles and chancel lights, the Christian Year, and the beauty of holiness in place of the cult of the unadorned. In themselves these matters of cult may be of minor import, but they indicate a change of mood.

A third sign—possibly the most important of all—is the revolution which is taking place in contemporary theology. This revolution is not easy to label by a word or a phrase. The names which are most frequently being applied to it are "Neo-orthodoxy" or "Biblical theology." The title of a recent book which describes, in autobiographical form, this new movement expresses its genius. The title is *On to Orthodoxy*.⁷ The

⁶ Donald Atwater, "The Breaking of Bread." In *Orate Fratres*. Jan. 21, 1940.

⁷ D. R. Davies, *On to Orthodoxy*, Hodder, 1939.

phrase evidences the same double polarity which we met in the ecumenical movement—a return which is also an advance.

In dealing with this return to Orthodoxy, we are again within the Protestant fold. There are no analogues, or very few, in Catholicism. Catholicism can claim that it never departed from Orthodoxy and therefore is called to no return. Define Orthodoxy in purely Catholic terms and the claim can be granted. But Catholic pride is a little out of place. A great war has been fought and won on the battlefield of modern thought. The Catholic has had little share in it.

“Gilead abode beyond the Jordan:
And Dan, why did he remain in ships?
Asher sat still at the haven of the sea
And abode by his creeks.”^a

Rome, for hundreds of years, has been Christianity in a medieval fortress. There is no question that she preserved Christianity in a purer form than that which Protestantism could show in some of its decadent recent manifestations. But Rome has not shared the conflict either. She cannot thrill to the cry of victory—“On to Orthodoxy.”

From the period of the Reformation onward Protestantism has been exposed to the onslaught of modernist thought. At first, with the great revolt itself behind it, the Reformation churches enjoyed a period of stabilization. They had the Bible and such church institutions as they had carried over from the long Christian past. The Bible always seemed safe—and the faith based on the Bible—a faith which linked the sixteenth century with the great age of the early Church.

But then came the enlightenment of the eighteenth century, with its trust in reason. Science emancipated itself from traditional controls. Evolutionary hypotheses became dogmas universally accepted, usually with uncritical abandon. The romantic movement in literature and art revolted against the decorum and checks of the “great tradition” of classical-Christian culture. Rousseau ruled supreme as the new prophet of emancipation. This romantic gospel freed man from the burden of personal responsibility for evil. The age-old Christian doctrine of original sin, along with the similar classical view of man as a being rooted in the sin of pride, gave way before the glorification of man as good by nature. Evil must be henceforth traced to society. Most of us have been brought up in this new climate of moral optimism and scarcely realize what a gulf separates us from all earlier centuries of civilized man.

^a Judges 5:17.

But not only did the general climate of thought suffer a profound revolution. The citadel of Christian faith itself was attacked. The Bible, its chief symbol in the Protestant world, could not escape the avalanche of modern scientific enlightenment. We have had a century now of historical scrutiny of this ancient holy Book. Most of us are sufficiently familiar with the lingering Bible Fundamentalisms of our day to realize what Protestantism has gone through. The dilemma which has confronted thousands of modern Christians has been tragic. This is true particularly of those whose childhood home was still one in the simple pietistic tradition and who then met the disillusionments of critical and intellectual reason in university and college. They had to choose, so they thought, between the integrity of the intellect and their heritage of naïve faith. The institutional Church had been overthrown as ultimate authority at the Reformation. Now the Bible as literal authority was gone also. To launch forth on an individualistic voyage of discovery of ultimate truth beckoned to some, but proved usually too great a burden. The average educated modern has lived, accordingly, on scraps and remnants of a torn faith and a broken tradition.

One alternative to complete surrender to intellectual skepticism, however, has not yet been mentioned. It is called Liberal Protestantism. A better name may be simply Modernism. These names are misleading if taken as descriptions, since the return to Orthodoxy of contemporary Christian thought, while it reacts violently against Liberal Protestantism, retains many of its "liberal" and even "modern" characteristics. Honest Christianity can never return again to the authoritarian literal Bible. To that extent the nineteenth century has won an irreversible victory.

The solution of Liberal Protestantism for the dilemma of modern Christianity seemed at first absurdly simple and satisfying. Historical and scientific scholarship had robbed the Bible of its absoluteness. Very well. But that same critical scholarship had brought into relief the historical itself. Miracles might vanish. The mysterious beliefs *about* Christ of the Pauline epistles and of the Christian creeds might be thought-forms of a dead past. The Old Testament might be merely the record of a primitive people's evolution from barbarism to a moral faith. But one rock remained, the Jesus central in this long history—a Jesus human, appealing, with a teaching above the relativities of history. Why should this not suffice?

At first contact a thrilling discovery! The Epistle to the Romans which, since Luther's day, had been thought to contain the heart of the Bible could now be relegated to an appendix. The Sermon on the Mount could take its place. The Jesus of these matchless chapters could capture the allegiance of the believer. The rest of the gospel story merely illustrated, in parable and healing acts, this ethic of humanitarian love. The cross was a dramatic climax to the biographical drama of Jesus' life. The gospel was, in fact, this hero-story. Faith became loyalty to the "hero," to His teaching. Practical discipleship could at last replace academic theology. A social gospel could now supplement individualistic piety, a carrying out of the ethic of love into the world of men. Morality could replace the long reign of doctrine. Nor was the concept "Church" meaningless in the new version of the Christian faith. The Church was the company of those who subscribed to the ideals of Jesus and put them into practice. It was the society called to build the Kingdom of God on earth.

Within the past generation, however, a great revolt has taken place against this modernist Christianity. For, as the modern world marched into the twentieth century, this optimistic, progressive Christianity broke under the strain of tragic events. The First World War marked a great turning point. How can the mere preaching of ethical ideals control the wild will of man? Men by nature simply do not love one another, and merely telling them that they *ought* to love will not produce power of performance. A wholly unrealistic view of human nature was discovered to underlie the reduced Christianity of Liberalism. In the face of Nazi barbarism, even the recently despised Christian doctrine of original sin made more practical sense. The appeal of Christianity as a beautiful hero-story was seen to be no substitute for an honest dealing with the God of conscience or of history.

Furthermore, historical scholarship dealing with the Bible, which at first seemed to validate a human Jesus-religion, turned against its own offspring. Jesus pictured as a teacher of humanitarian ethics, if viewed by a more penetrating analysis, never existed. He is a creation of sentimental imagination. The Gospels are not "hero-story" biographies. The Sermon on the Mount, read in its context, is not a blueprint of ethical progress which men merely need to admire in order to achieve. Read against the background of the Old Testament, with its fear of the God of the Law, the Sermon on the Mount is far more like a dress rehearsal

of Judgment Day. It confronts man with the unachievable holiness of Deity. Repentance, not achievement, is the first response.

Modernist Christianity saw itself confronted by an impasse. It could repudiate the Bible altogether and become a disembodied humanism, or it would, in some way, in order to be Christianity at all, have to return to tradition—to Orthodoxy. Could this return be achieved without treachery to intellectual conscience, and without repudiating the positive achievements of Renaissance, Enlightenment, Science and historical criticism? Could there be a "modern" Orthodoxy?

Such an Orthodoxy is here. It is still in its infancy. Yet hundreds of Christian scholars and theological students are already breathing the bracing air of a rediscovered biblical Christianity. The story of the rebirth of belief in the Bible is as yet little known outside the halls of theological learning. A decadent Protestantism still reigns in much contemporary church life. But, to use military metaphor, the lines have somehow held. The future, outwardly dark, can be faced with a new courage.

To describe this new Orthodoxy at any length is not possible here. One clue to its solution of the problem of the Bible is, however, very simple. The sacred Christian Book had been robbed of its divinity. It was thought of as a history Book—a human history Book. Nineteenth-century criticism had subjected the Bible to historical scrutiny. Very well. Push the scrutiny to its conclusions and the Bible discloses a story, a drama of amazing proportions and meaning. Jesus remains at the center of the story, but He must be seen in perspective. The Bible must be read as a whole or not at all. It was written by members of a community of faith, and can be understood only *in* faith. The Book telling the story, however, is not the story itself. Once interpreted from within the community of faith in which it appeared, it is seen to contain a revelation from outside of history. God is the chief actor, not man. Man can only respond to God's "mighty acts," as He commands, judges, and then Himself appears in history—coming down from heaven—and redeems man through a mysterious death and resurrection.

The preceding has furnished only a passing glimpse into the theological revolution sweeping across the Protestant world today. The sketch has been brief since our theme is not this revolution itself but its meaning for Christian unity. Has it significance for the coming Great Church?

It has great meaning—quite possibly greater meaning than the

ecumenical movements of our time themselves. It has saved Protestantism. And Protestantism is needed for the Church of God of the future. An observer of Christianity at the turn of the twentieth century might have predicted that Catholicism would soon be the only form of Christianity left. Yet this would have been a Christianity which had refused to face modern thought. It must never be forgotten that Catholicism (I speak of Rome now) is still fundamentalist in its view of the Bible. This may look like strength, but it is tragic weakness. The battle for preserving the Bible for the modern world has been a Protestant battle—and has led to a Protestant victory. Catholicism itself may, under the rule of God over His universal Church, some day thank her belittled rival for protecting the rock upon which she, too, in spite of all her doctrines of the papacy, is built—the Bible.

No Christian unity can be other than a community of faith. Without a shared faith, the concept of "Church" is ultimately meaningless. Christian faith must rest on acts of God beyond or previous to the Church herself. There is no other such resting place than the revelation of God in history enshrined in the Bible. Its recovery, therefore, was and is a prerequisite for Christian reunion.

Bible-Christianity and Church-Christianity have faced each other across a chasm for centuries. They were not meant thus to be divorced from each other. In the Bible itself they are joined, for the Bible is Church-religion. Is it too much to hope that Bible-Christianity and Church-Christianity can again meet and become one? Such an event of reunion will not take place without great tribulations. The divided Christianities will each be compelled to submit to judgment. Bible-Christianity will have to rediscover the centrality of the Church of God in the Holy Scriptures themselves. Church-Christianity will have to yield its pretensions of being a substitute for the Redemption wrought "once for all" by God Himself. But God still rules in history. The Church is a community of expectancy. Let a mood of expectancy penetrate the slumbering people of God and the miracle of the reborn Great Church can happen. "And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation."⁹

⁹ Isaiah 25:9.

The New Testament and a Changing Liberalism

CLINTON M. CHERRY

I

IN HIS book, *Types of Religious Philosophy*, E. A. Burt has characterized liberalism or modernism as not a coherent religious philosophy so much as a tendency among Christian thinkers who have allowed themselves to be influenced by modernity. Arising as a response to successive attacks on traditional Christianity, making concessions where unavoidable but retaining as much of the old Christianity as possible, liberalism was in a sense a method of compromise. It made no definite break with the past; it advanced tentatively into the present; it tested new ideas for their worth and accepted them when they seemed sound; it reinterpreted its Christian tradition so as to preserve the essence of it.

What were the hard facts that made this procedure seem wise? Basic was the appearance of modern science, whose roots as to method go back to Roger Bacon in the thirteenth century, but whose modern content stems from the heliocentric world of Copernicus, Galileo and Newton of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The first religious reaction to this was the rationalism of the eighteenth century with its deism and Lockian social philosophy, which gave birth, as everyone knows, to American democracy. This rationalism broke down under Hume's criticism to revive, following the idealistic revolution of Kant, in the new rationalism of Hegel. Meanwhile empiric science went on its successful way. It received enormous impetus with the publication in 1859 of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, a theory in biology that quickly became a comprehensive pattern of scientific thought, supplementing the mechanical view of nature that prevailed after Newton. The evolutionary interpretation permeated every field of investigation. We may note, for our purpose, that it produced in Bible study the modern science of higher criticism and in the field of religion the study of comparative religion. It rewrote psychology and brought sociology into being. It gave birth in the philosophic realm to the instrumentalism of John Dewey.

Now the reaction of liberalism to all this was to recognize what seemed to be fact and to make such adjustments on the basis of a rein-

terpretation of the Christian tradition as seemed necessary. Since it was a piecemeal reaction and not one guided by a single philosophical principle the result was heterogeneous in its parts. Liberals differed from each other all the way from near-orthodoxy to a radicalism that finally issued in humanism. Consequently it is difficult to describe liberalism in a word. In the main, however, it was an attempt at religious empiricism, with a shifting of the basis of religious authority, by imperceptible degrees, from revelation to experience. It has been said, with some justification, that the Reformation took authority from the Church and vested it in the Bible. Liberalism took it from the Bible and vested it in the individual, or, better, in human experience.

The foregoing sketch of its history makes obvious how difficult it is to give any adequate description of contemporary liberalism. For the purpose of this paper, however, the characterization of it by H. Shelton Smith, in his book, *Faith and Nurture*, is significant, because Smith, as a religious educator, is dealing with liberalism at the point where it has made its greatest impact upon the Church. He finds it to be characterized by (1) the idea of *divine immanence*—"the idea of God as the indwelling reality of one organic and developing world-process" (p. 6); (2) the belief in growth or *evolutionary development*, in the individual and society—progress *sans* crises toward the Kingdom of God within and without; (3) faith in the *goodness of man*, evil being merely "the fruit of wrong education and of an antisocial environment" (p. 15), man himself being inherently divine and infinitely perfectible; (4) an emphasis on *the historical* (i.e., human) *Jesus* who was found to speak "a language which the modern age, with its genial confidence in man, its vivid interest in the present world and its profound concern for social betterment, is peculiarly fitted to understand" (p. 19, quoted from C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, p. 303); (5) an understanding of salvation as catching Jesus' spirit of *sacrificial love* and being transformed thereby; and (6) a construing of *the Kingdom of God as the ideal social order* to be realized by bettering human conditions of living, particularly through an extension of democracy into the economic realm. This liberal Christianity went hand in glove with the emerging educational technique emphasizing pupil centeredness by which all education began, not with subject matter, but with the pupil, his nature, his interests, his needs. A new religious education grew up, characterized by child study, graded materials, "learning by doing," character development through education in attitudes, skills and

enriching knowledge, and the use of the Bible as resource material only. It was, in short, a Christianity with a new and important emphasis on man.

All will doubtless agree that this movement was not completely unfortunate. Certainly the orthodoxy of, say, Bushnell's day needed to be pulled down a little out of the clouds, and the educational techniques of church as well as school needed to take greater account of real human nature in the child as well as in the adult. But, as Bushnell himself feared, the movement went too far. An incipient humanism became an overt and avowed "religion" neither bowing nor speaking to an unnecessary God. This religious humanism made a great stir with the publication of Walter Lippmann's book, *A Preface to Morals*. Then it was that many Christians felt that the limit had been reached. Lippmann, who had aimed a barb specifically at Harry Emerson Fosdick, drew from him an able reply in his book, *As I See Religion*, and Fosdick himself began to inject a new and different note into his preaching. Meanwhile Karl Barth was being read in America and, his followers multiplying, the attack on liberalism in general began in earnest.

Those who take kindly to the new supernaturalism in one of its current forms rejoice in this new trend. They point out with justification that the tendency in liberalism was in the direction of humanism and that the same trend in humanism has produced the skepticism of Joseph Wood Krutch, who can only say: "Ours is a lost cause and there is no place for us in the natural universe, but we are not, for all that, sorry to be human. We should rather die as men than live as animals."¹ A healthy instinct finds something radically wrong with this resignation and it would rather be blatantly supernaturalistic than ever more weakly humanistic. Nevertheless, let us admit that Christian liberalism made a valuable contribution to Christian thought. It would be well if its protest against an unreal theology were kept clearly in mind during the current process of change in Christian thinking.

One of the points at which the attack on romantic liberalism is being directed is in the field of New Testament criticism. This will come as a surprise in view of the fact that higher criticism was one of the influences that shaped the course of liberalism. Shelton Smith quotes E. F. Scott as saying: "At the close of the last century, New Testament scholars, in spite of their numberless differences on points of detail, were agreed on the general interpretation of the life and work of Jesus. He was the

¹ *The Modern Temper*, by Joseph Wood Krutch.

prophet of a new righteousness, based on a new conception of the nature of God and of man's relation to God."² It must be admitted that the picture that liberal theology drew of Jesus was attractive, and will continue to have worth. But scholars like Schweitzer blasted away a Jesus who was a twentieth-century reformer, and other scholars like Dodd found again in the Gospels what liberals had explained away but on faulty grounds, and the result seems to be a regaining of the faith of our fathers on a new basis, a thoroughly honest and rigorously disciplined understanding of the New Testament.

It is this aspect of the matter that is the particular concern of this paper. In what specific ways has recent New Testament scholarship contributed to the changes taking place in current Christian thinking?

II

The first of these—and basic to the whole of the new scholarship—is the necessity of seeing the New Testament against its background of the Christian community. For the New Testament did not produce Christianity; Christianity produced the New Testament. This is an insight of enormous significance. Christianity was not in the first place a book religion, and, it may be added, it cannot be so now.³ Anything and everything that throws light on that all-important first Christian community needs to be known, and the New Testament itself needs to be read for such light. The Gospels in particular need to be understood as reflecting as much the belief and the needs of the early Church as revealing information about Jesus. Not that there is an irreconcilable cleavage between Jesus and the generation that preserved the memory of His life and teaching, but that all that we know about Jesus is mediated to us by a community that believed something about Him and was organized to propagate⁴ that belief. Out of the preaching, teaching, exhorting and disciplining necessary to such a community came the New Testament, a by-product of its faith and life.

Now this result of New Testament study may, of course, be interpreted to mean that we are forever separated from the real Jesus. This is, in fact, the conclusion drawn by many Form critics. R. H. Lightfoot's words are already famous: "For all the inestimable value of the Gospels,

² *Faith and Nurture*, p. 26.

³ This is not a new insight since it was voiced by Lessing (see C. C. McCown, *The Search for the Real Jesus*, pp. 36f.).

they yield us little more than a whisper of His voice; we trace in them but the outskirts of His ways." ⁴ But another conclusion is possible to those whose predilections permit it. It is possible to say that the truest thing about the New Testament is precisely the faith it enshrines, its God-in-Christ. Far from hiding the real Jesus, this faith sets forth the only Jesus there was. It is useless to look in the New Testament for indications of another kind of Jesus. All is faith, and historically the Christian Church has no right to exist save to realize this faith and to propagate it.

This does not mean that there remain no critical problems in respect of this faith. In what sense, one may ask, did Jesus hold it concerning Himself? Did the early Christians hold it in any different sense? Did the Jewish Christians hold it in the same sense as the later Gentile Christians? Does not the New Testament itself reveal different theories of Sonship, and are the later creeds legitimate extensions of New Testament meanings? How shall we frame the faith today? But no answer can be given these questions which can dislodge the initial Christian conviction of God-in-Christ. The New Testament sprang from this conviction, and but for it, would not be. There is nothing in the New Testament which is unrelated to it for there was no way for anything to get into the New Testament save in the interest of the faith. This clearly forces the issue concerning that faith: either God did do something unique in and through Jesus or He did not. If He did not, then the faith that brought the New Testament into being is false, and the historical *raison d'être* of the Christian Church is no longer cogent, and Christianity in any historical sense of the word ceases to be. It does seem as if the Church, the New Testament and the faith all belong together.

III

A second contribution of modern scholarship to an understanding of the New Testament is a frank recognition of its eschatological background. This was the great stone of stumbling to liberal Christianity. Because of it the cry was, "Back to the Jesus of history," and out of this effort came the "liberal" lives of Jesus, "psychologizing" Jesus and "spiritualizing" the Kingdom, as Schweitzer put it. But Schweitzer insisted, and rightly, that we cannot get rid of eschatology either by ignoring it or attempting to explain it away. The whole background of the

⁴ *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, p. 225.

New Testament and of the Gospels—and of Jesus Himself—is eschatological. The one to have explored this most meaningfully is C. H. Dodd, who, starting with the apostolic preaching as revealed in the early chapters of *The Acts* and reflected incidentally in Paul's writings, shows how the Christian community, as we see it in the New Testament, considered itself the New Israel, the end-community, so to speak, which was the inheritor of all the promises of God through Jesus the Christ. As Paul put it: "How many soever be the promises of God, in him is the Yea; wherefore also through him is the Amen, unto the glory of God *through us*" (II Corinthians 1:20). So great became the early Christian interest in the fulfillment of prophecy that it went to extremes in some cases. But—and here the real Jesus of history is revealed—it never lost touch with its memory of the Man of Galilee nor attempted to build up a purely imaginary portrait on the basis of prophecy alone. All unfulfilled prophecy it relegated to the future Second Coming in majesty. The Second Coming as such was only part of and subordinate to the conviction that the last times had already arrived and God had inaugurated the new age in Jesus, His death and resurrection, in the gift of the Spirit and in the community of the faithful, the body of Christ.

Now what is the meaning of this eschatology? Liberal Christianity, as we have seen, regarded it as something to be pruned away because it belonged to the thought forms of an older day and was incompatible with the evolutionary concept of things. There is some historical justification for this point of view. Martin Dibelius, in his book, *The Sermon on the Mount* (p. 106), well says that since 300 A. D. the members of the Christian Church have lived under entirely different circumstances from those presupposed in the Sermon on the Mount—and, of course, the New Testament generally. Moreover, the world has not come to an end, and Christian history, so far as it has been progressive, has been a matter of slowly achieving good things—the abolition of slavery; the exaltation of womanhood; the ministry to the orphaned and the aged, the sick and the crazed; the opposition to organized vice and the achievement of democracy; and now, the questions of economic democracy, racial equality, the abolition of war. Are not these achievements and efforts in the light of the continuing historical process the only logical rationale of a Kingdom of God that was originally conditioned by eschatology only because it came into being in a day of eschatology? So reasoned Christian liberalism.

But the recalcitrant eschatology of the New Testament gives us, if we will have it so, a profound understanding of God's purpose. It may be that against uneschatological history we can see the purpose of eschatology in history. It may be that God willed the eschatological setting for the life and teachings of Jesus and the birth of the Christian Church in order to reveal His purpose and will to the world. For how else could the absolute will of God be made known except under conditions that were in themselves absolute? For once in human history, by the power of eschatology, the spirit of man was free to become one with the Spirit of God. For once and for all, a supreme Man could so identify Himself with God—or vice versa, if you wish—that He could act for Him in a towering manifestation of divine judgment and mercy through a deed of surpassing self-sacrifice. From this point of view the Messianic consciousness of Jesus becomes entirely explicable and makes irrelevant the strictures on His sanity by such men as Leuba. Living also under the power of eschatology, the early Christians, Paul among them, were able to think through the meaning and significance of Jesus' words and deeds in relation to the absolute will of God. And—what liberalism inclined to ignore entirely—the New Testament could conceive the Church to be not only the inheritor of God's promises but the community within which the Kingdom should find earthly realization, the will of God be done on earth as it is done in heaven.

What a far cry this is from our but recent disparagement of the Church, and our fond hope that, the Church being what it is, the Kingdom of God might be realized by some external means, political or social, educational and developmental. But we know now that there can be no Kingdom where the very idea of the Kingdom does not exist. We know that we have here on earth no abiding city. We know we must take the Church more seriously and make it what it ought to be, grimly conscious of the fact that if it fails, all is lost so far as the Kingdom is concerned. We know, moreover, that there is no such thing as automatic or inevitable progress and that to its end history will be a struggle between good and evil with only such meaning as can be measured by the revelation of God culminating in Christ. To this revelation the Church is the witness in its preaching and in its fellowship about the Lord's Table. Thus each age comes under God's judgment in order to realize God's mercy, and the Church as the eschatological community, living in the presence of God, proclaims the judgment and mediates the mercy.

IV

This brings us to the final consideration: the place and pertinence of the teachings of Jesus. Dodd points out that teaching in the early Church was distinct as a function from preaching. Preaching was proclamation: proclamation of the act of God in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, thus fulfilling prophecy and bringing the dawn of the new age. The preaching always ended in an invitation to participate in the new age by accepting the act of God by faith, believing that the Christ was Jesus, and receiving forgiveness and new life in the Spirit. That was early Christian preaching. Teaching, on the other hand, was edification of the elect and delineation of conduct for those who had accepted Jesus as the Christ, whose words, as B. S. Eaton points out,⁵ were cherished as of a second and greater Moses, the prophet promised in the book of Deuteronomy (18:15. See The Acts 3:22). A tradition of the sayings of Jesus, therefore, goes back as far as the message concerning Him, for the two were integral to each other.

Now the Christian world has always been troubled with the absolute ethic of Jesus. Let it be said to the credit of liberalism that the conflict was felt there much more keenly and the effort to obey Jesus made much more earnestly than in traditional orthodoxy. This was because liberalism dissolved away the eschatological matrix of the teachings of Jesus and, having accepted Him as a social prophet, had perforce no alternative than to attempt to follow Him literally. It is no accident that pacifism has its stronghold among liberal Christians. In this particular, in fact, liberalism may lie much nearer to the mind of Jesus and the purpose of God than the orthodoxy that puts Jesus in a stained-glass window and worships Him as incomparably divine and therefore too great to follow. It must surely be that the teachings of Jesus are intended to goad us out of our complacency, to create in our hearts unresolved conflict, unending tension and a sense of sin. This, we may believe, is the will of God for our world. But nevertheless we must see the New Testament background for the problem. And in this connection I can do no better than to quote Dodd:

"His (Jesus') ethical teaching is no system of general casuistry, nor yet an 'interim-ethic' for a brief and special period in human history. It is the absolute ethic of the Kingdom of God, the moral principles of a new order of life. The implied major premise of all His ethical sayings is the affirmation 'The Kingdom

⁵ *Christ in the Gospels*, p. 30.

of God has come upon you'—The Kingdom of God has come upon you, therefore love your enemies that you may be sons of your Father in heaven. The Kingdom of God has come upon you, therefore if hand or foot offend, cut it off: it is better to enter into the Kingdom of God even maimed. The Kingdom of God has come upon you, therefore take no thought for your life, but seek first His Kingdom. The Kingdom of God has come upon you, therefore judge not, for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, in the judgment which is inseparable from the coming of God in His Kingdom. The ethic of Jesus is not an ethic for those who expect (only) the speedy end of the world, but for those who have experienced the end of this world and the coming of the Kingdom of God."⁶

It is obvious that we face here the same problem that we do in the general eschatological outlook of the early Church. And what we must see is that these teachings of Jesus are principles which must be practiced *if* the world we know were dissolved and therefore must be attempted *in order that* the world may be dissolved and the Kingdom of God take its place. Therefore, to quote Dodd again:

"The ethical teaching of Jesus is set forth in absolute terms, without the question of its practicability under these or those conditions being expressly raised. When we contemplate that teaching as a whole, we can see that these moral principles are indeed principles on which the best kind of human life could be lived. The nearer we could get to love for our enemies, to uncalculating self-sacrifice, to a serene freedom from all self-regarding cares, and to a broad charity that never judges our neighbor, the finer, truer, holier and happier would human life become. Of that we cannot doubt. Moreover, when once we have seen the precepts of Jesus in this way, we are under obligation to them. Not only so, but the grace of God which places us within His Kingdom becomes a source of moral power towards the attainment of such ideals. But we deceive ourselves if we suppose that ever in this world we could fulfill these precepts of Jesus with the absoluteness that is inherent in them. We never do and never can love our enemies, or even our friendly neighbors, as we love ourselves; we never can be completely single-minded; we never can be entirely free from selfish cares, from feelings of anger, from lustful thought; we never can be merciful as our Father in heaven is merciful; and if we understand the absoluteness with which Jesus made these demands, we shall not suppose ourselves capable of fulfilling them. They are not of this world, though they are to be put into practice in this world. They stand for the unattainable which we are bound to strive to attain. For to 'receive the Kingdom of God' is to place ourselves under this absolute obligation. And yet—'when we have done all, say, "We are unprofitable servants: we have only done our duty."'"⁷

In the light of this understanding we see that the teachings of Jesus are not only our goal but also our judgment. Being our judgment they convict us of sin and bring us under the mercy of God. That is part of the meaning of the cross. On its worldly side the cross is man's

⁶ C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, p. 125.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 127.

answer to the ethic of Jesus: "It can't be lived; away with you and what you stand for!"—and those who try to live Jesus' ethic will share this cross with Him. But on its divine side, the cross is the judgment of God, as showing us the consequence to God of disobeying Jesus, yet offering us in its sacrificial love the mercy of God. Thus the teachings of Jesus are something more than a challenge to achieve salvation by Christ-like living; they are the means by which we are thrown upon the mercy of God. Christlike living follows salvation; it is not a substitute for it.

To sum up, the message of Jesus and of the New Testament concerning the Kingdom is that something greater than the present order of things is in the making, is already here. It is better than what is and people are invited by becoming Christians to participate in it. It is not man-made but God-given, and its consummation, if the New Testament is true, is in the hands of God, not man. Christians, therefore, are in the world, but not of it, and though they are implicated in the life of the world and must do what they can to alleviate evil conditions and make the world safe for democracy, or whatever seems the best good at the moment, the real life of the Spirit is to be found within their own company. In time, moreover, the Christian comes to know the "wonderfully serene longing for death," as Schweitzer puts it in describing Bach and his music, a desire to inherit the perfection of the heavenly places. For, as that great scholar-missionary points out in his little volume, *Christianity and the Religions of the World* (p. 82), Christianity is pessimistic with regard to this world and optimistic with regard to God's purpose for mankind. "And I, John, saw a new heaven and a new earth" (Revelation 21:1).

V

To many this will be a return to orthodoxy. In a sense it is. But it is a new orthodoxy built on a new understanding of the New Testament, shutting its eyes to no discoverable truth, and built on a foundation that is more solid than the old. For a while it looked as if the new approach to the Bible would rob us of our faith or substitute for it the pale shadow of forgotten things, but now it looks as if that faith, with some new understandings of it, will become as firmly entrenched as ever. Tomorrow ought to be a great day for the Church of Jesus Christ.

James Moffatt

1870-1944

ERNEST FINDLAY SCOTT

IN A quieter time the death of Dr. James Moffatt, on June 27 of this year, would have created a sense of loss all over the Christian world; and even in these stormy days, when the individual seems to count for nothing, there must have been thousands who felt that a great figure had passed from the scene. Doctor Moffatt had a unique place among the writers and teachers of the Church. He was known to scholars as one of the finest critical minds of his generation. He was known to the general public as the translator who had changed the Bible into a modern Book. To a smaller and yet a wide circle he was a beloved friend, who exemplified in his own person that Christian message which it was his lifelong task to interpret.

There have been few men who lived more strenuously, but on the surface his career was a tranquil one. He was born at Glasgow, the son of a well-known member of the stock exchange and elder and active member of the Free Church of Scotland. After his elementary schooling he attended Glasgow Academy, which had then a famous headmaster in Doctor Morrison, father of the brilliant preacher, George H. Morrison. Moffatt and he were contemporaries at school and afterwards at college, though they were men of quite different types of mind. As a schoolboy Moffatt was more interested in athletics than in books, and his enthusiasm for games never left him. To the end of his days he closely followed the football reports in the Scottish papers, and when he came to America acquainted himself with the mysteries of baseball, and was an ardent spectator of the more important games. Toward the end of his school days, however, he had a long illness which compelled him to spend most of his time in reading, and this was henceforth his ruling passion. When he was still a young man Dr. Alexander Whyte, of Edinburgh, who was no mean judge, pronounced him the best-read man he had ever met. He read with amazing quickness, and yet with close attention, carefully marking every passage that struck him. There is no valuable book in existence of which he could not give some account, while in English literature, and in his own special field of New Testament criticism, his knowledge was inexhaustible. It might well have proved a burden to

him, but he had the power to digest what he read and make it an active part of his own mind.

From school he passed to Glasgow University, which was then enjoying its golden age. Jebb in Greek, Caird in philosophy, Kelvin in physics were the world's foremost masters in their several subjects, and there were others in that remarkable Arts Faculty who were hardly less eminent. Moffatt always looked back to his four years at Glasgow University as the formative period of his life. He took the work easily, and troubled himself little about college prizes, but he was quietly finding himself. He told me that in Edward Caird's class in philosophy he first discovered that he had a mind. As a result of this discovery he chose the study of religion as his life's work.

From the university he therefore passed to the Free Church Theological College at Glasgow, and it was here that he first gave evidence of exceptional gifts. He was fortunate in having as his New Testament teacher A. B. Bruce, a man of lofty character and rich, original mind, who at least on one occasion was prosecuted for heresy. This was an honor which the Free Church bestowed only on its best men, and Bruce shared it with Robertson Smith, George Adam Smith and Marcus Dodds. Bruce was quick to recognize Moffatt's ability, and kindled in him his own enthusiasm for New Testament study. It was to this teacher that Moffatt dedicated his first book, and he never ceased to acknowledge that Bruce had influenced him more than any other man. Most of his work at college was in the New Testament, but he extended his interest to all branches of theological study. In the general examination at the close of his course he was first among the students of the four Free Church colleges.

Ordained a minister he had his first charge at the historic village of Dundonald in Ayrshire, where a ruined castle still bears witness that it was the cradle of the Stuart monarchy, and at one time the capital of Scotland. Here Moffatt settled, and was married, and spent some delightful years. His work in the little church afforded him a good deal of leisure, and he threw himself almost at once into a project which had been for some time in his mind, to arrange the New Testament writings in their true chronological order, and on this basis to trace out their affinities and the process of development in early Christian thought. He meant to employ the Revised Version, but when he had finished his work he was informed by the Oxford Press that he must not use the Version if he altered it in any respect. This was a blow that might have pros-

trated another man, but after a few gloomy days he sat down resolutely to translate the whole New Testament for himself. It cost him a year or two of exacting labor, and he found, when he was done, that his book needed to be rewritten; but at last *The Historical New Testament* appeared, in a large and impressive volume. At once it compelled general attention. For the first time the results of New Testament criticism were brought before the English-speaking world in a form which everyone could understand. Though he was still a man under thirty, Moffatt took his place among the foremost living scholars, and was promoted to the venerable degree of Doctor of Divinity. No Scottish university had ever before conferred this honor on so young a man, and there were many indignant protests; but if the degree was exceptional so was the man.

From this time onward all work by Doctor Moffatt was in eager demand. He was appointed to various lectureships. He was placed on the staff of the leading theological journals. He fell into the snares of Robertson Nicholl, whose chief delight was to discover new talent, and enlist it in the service of his publishing house. J. M. Barrie and Edgar Wallace were among his victims, and Moffatt was another. Certainly he was driven hard by this taskmaster, but he proved equal to every labor, and perhaps the compulsion was good for him. Much of his best work, including his monumental translation of the Bible, would never have been done except for the goading of Robertson Nicholl.

After six or seven fruitful years at Dundonald, Moffatt was transferred to Broughty Ferry, a flourishing suburb of Dundee. The appointment was a singularly happy one, for he came in succession to James Denney, who was an outstanding New Testament scholar like himself. Denney had now become professor at Glasgow, but still kept up a connection with his former church, and the older and younger men became fast friends. In his new charge Moffatt had less time at his disposal than in the quiet village, and while he still contrived to carry on his literary work he gained practical experience as a minister. The danger of all New Testament critics is to forget that the book they study was written by active missionaries, whose primary interest was in the work of the Church. Moffatt now learned to understand the New Testament from the inside. He could never have made himself such an accomplished critic if he had not also been a preacher and a shepherd of souls.

It had long been evident, however, that his destiny was that of a theological teacher, and in 1911 he was called to Mansfield College,

Oxford. He could now devote himself wholly to the work of scholarship, and in the metropolis of learning he found every help and encouragement. The famous men of Oxford received him from the first on an equal footing. They not only knew him already by his books, but were attracted to him as a man. In Oxford and Cambridge, more perhaps than anywhere else, men are valued for their personal qualities. Learning is so abundant that it is taken for granted; reputations also are plentiful, and count for little. But in a community which lives by itself, and is in many ways a social club, a man has to make himself personally acceptable or nobody wants him. Few men endeared themselves more to Oxford society than Doctor Moffatt, and when he left, after a few years, the university gave him its jealously guarded D.D. degree, in company with F. C. Burkitt and Dean Inge.

He left Oxford to succeed his old friend Denney a second time, at the Glasgow Theological College. As professor at Glasgow he spent the twelve busiest years of his crowded life. His books flowed out in an unceasing stream; one of the leading features in the *Hibbert Journal* was his quarterly survey, in which he reviewed all the current theological literature; for some time he acted as editor of the *Expositor*; he began his admirable series of Commentaries on the books of the New Testament. Along with his teaching and his literary work he took an active part in the life of the Church, preaching somewhere almost every week and serving on various committees. All the Scottish churches were grateful to him for the assistance he gave in the making of the new Hymnal, which bears witness everywhere to his fine literary taste and his skill in music.

It was a surprise to everyone when in 1927 he settled in New York, as professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary. On several occasions he had visited this country as a lecturer, and had been strongly attracted by it. He had a long-standing friendship with President Coffin, and felt that he could work happily under his direction. Behind all his other motives, as he once confided to me, was a feeling that he could do little more in the New Testament field, and needed to devote himself to a new subject, under new conditions. As it turned out he did not fulfill his intention of concentrating henceforth on Church History. The only book he wrote on his new subject was a short account of the *First Five Centuries*, so admirably done that we cannot but regret the larger works which he never finished, most notably a study of Tertullian for which he had gathered ample materials.

The remainder of his life was spent in this country, except for summer visits to England and Scotland, and a Sabbatical year in which he traveled to Australia and Malaya. He identified himself thoroughly with the land of his adoption, and made many of his dearest friendships among its people. He will leave an enduring mark on the Christian life of America by the work he did on the new revision of the Bible, which was his chief interest in his closing years. After his retirement from the seminary he divided his time between a lectureship at Drew University and this revision. Before he died he had the satisfaction of seeing the New Testament ready for the press, and the Old Testament well on its way to completion. It sometimes happens that after a calm and happy life the scene is suddenly darkened, and so it was with Doctor Moffatt. He deserved, if any man ever did, to end his days in peace, but in his last two years calamities gathered around him, and he had to bear up against them with broken health. They served, however, to bring out the real man that was in him. He suffered with a quiet courage; he was gentle and considerate as he had always been; his mind was always on great subjects, and about himself and his troubles he said nothing. He allowed no weakness or anxiety to distract him from his work, and though I saw him constantly in those closing months I can think of only one day when he was idle. That was the day on which he died.

From his youth onward he was one of the most lovable of men. His opinions sometimes aroused bitter controversies, but his worst enemies were disarmed when they met the man himself, and found him so modest and kindly. They were apt, indeed, to misjudge him. A shrewd old Scottish minister observed to me long ago, "That young man Moffatt seems to give way to everybody, but I tell you, when he has once made up his mind, I would as soon try to move a mountain." All his life long he was making friends. In his youth they were often great men of a past generation, drawn to him by his early fame, and as he grew old himself many of them were his students. He was perfectly free from jealousy, and from all sense of superiority, and while he had some strong prejudices they never affected his relations to human beings. Shortly before his death he quoted to me a remark which he much appreciated: "I refused to meet the fellow, lest it might blunt the keen edge of my animosity." This had always been his own weakness. He was able to quarrel only with people whom he did not know.

Doctor Moffatt was so much identified with his books that to many

people he seemed to be only a kind of machine for producing them; but nothing is more remarkable about the books than their rich human quality. However abstract the subject may be he put life into it. He linked every doctrine or theory with some actual experience. If he had never written anything he would still have had an active and satisfying life. He was devoted to his family and his countless friends. He loved to be out in the open country. He was a golfer and a fisherman and a musician, and in the last war did duty, I believe very creditably, as a special constable. His destiny had thrown him into a world of books but he could have found enough to interest him in a warehouse or on a desert island.

I asked him once how many books he had written, but he could not tell me. In his more energetic years he usually had two or three on hand at the same time, and before one was finished he was planning another which it had suggested. Besides his books he wrote countless reviews, and there was scarcely a month in which an article did not appear somewhere with his signature. The sheer bulk of his work is astonishing, all the more so as he never wrote without careful attention to language as well as facts.

The range of his books is no less impressive than their number. In all the departments into which New Testament study is now divided, Moffatt was at home, and he knew almost as much about the Old Testament as the New. There is scarcely any theological subject which he did not handle like a master in one or another of his books. Some of them are outside of the theological field altogether. He wrote an excellent study of George Meredith. He edited the Sonnets of Shakespeare and several of the plays. His book on the Bible in Scottish literature is of standard value. He published several anthologies in which he rescued the treasure from books which have suffered shipwreck. For his recreation he once wrote a detective novel, and so learned for the first time that literature might be made to pay. But after this one trespass he returned to the less bountiful pastures of theology.

In addition to his own books he did service, in his earlier years as a translator, and it was through him that Harnack's great work, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, was made known to English readers. His translation was so good that he was urged to take up another German theologian who was much in vogue at that time, but when he had done several chapters he stopped. "I saw," he told me, "that when I made him speak plain English the man was a humbug." Perhaps it

was this experience which made him shy of German theology and of German thought generally. He felt that in the German language there is a foggy quality which magnifies all objects, and that German ideas, seen through a more lucid medium, have a way of shrinking into nonsense or platitude. He had a high respect for German scholarship on its critical and philological side, but for his thinking he preferred to look elsewhere. Foremost among his books must be placed his translation of the Bible. It was a great achievement to make people feel that the Bible was such a Book as might be written today, and that it bore directly on their own human interests. Moffatt not merely translated the Bible, but by his happy use of modern language he elucidated it, often compressing into a single word the substance of a long exposition. Also he embodied in his translation the results of a lifelong study of biblical criticism. Almost in every verse there is some subtle change in which an expert can detect a careful judgment on some vexed problem of interpretation. It would have been easy to mangle and vulgarize the noble version of the Bible which has become one of our most sacred possessions, but while changing it, sometimes radically, Moffatt has preserved its dignity.

Another of his outstanding books is his *Introduction to the New Testament*. For many years this has been the standard English work on the subject, and in spite of all later advances in New Testament criticism it still holds the field. Moffatt had the critical faculty in a rare degree, and could perceive, like an able judge, where the truth must lie, even when the evidence was incomplete and advocates had done their best to confuse it. It is always a pleasure to go back to Moffatt's handling of any debated New Testament question. He cleared away all that was irrelevant. He holds just balance between conflicting opinions. His conclusion was almost always that which would commend itself to a competent scholar at the present day.

As a commentator, even more than as a critic, Moffatt held a distinguished place. His early commentary on the book of Revelation was the first in the English language to dispel the darkness of that long-suffering book. He did a similar service, on a more elaborate scale, for the Epistle to the Hebrews. Only the other year he published what is perhaps the finest of all the many commentaries on First Corinthians. Besides these commentaries of his own he planned and edited the well-known series which bears his name. He based it on the idea, which had occurred to no one before, that a commentary ought not to be merely

a work of reference, like a dictionary, but a readable book, which might be interesting from end to end.

The last of Doctor Moffatt's writings appeared only a month or two before his death, and bears the title, *The Thrill of Tradition*. In this book with which he closed it, he may be said to explain and justify his career. He devoted himself to the study of bygone days because he felt intensely that the past is still living. We can have faith in God amidst the confusions of the present, for he has been our God in all generations. Beliefs and customs and institutions which seem to be nothing but an encumbrance have still an energy in them, if we could only respond to it, which will bear us forward. Out of the fullness of his knowledge and reflection Doctor Moffatt shows what tradition has meant in the life of the Church, and what it must always mean if the stream is not to be cut off from its springs. We feel, as we read his book, that all his exploration of the past had been a labor of love. He had found a "thrill" in what seemed only to be dead tradition.

It is not yet possible to form any estimate of the permanent value of Doctor Moffatt's work. A scholar, for that part, does not ask that his work should be permanent. When someone wrote to Dean Alford that his great Commentary would always hold its place, he answered: "If that is so, I have wasted my labor. My dearest hope is that what I have done will open the way for others, and the sooner I am left behind the more I shall reap my reward." This is the attitude of every genuine scholar, and it was certainly that of the gallant and generous soul who has now gone from us. He worked for the glory of God, and was content to do the task assigned to him in his own generation. The whole Church is witness that he performed it nobly. He wrote, for the most part, for scholars like himself, and they all admire his learning, his sincerity, his instinct for the central issues in every question he set himself to answer. He worked also for the common man, and enabled multitudes who had never even heard of criticism to read their Bible with a new understanding. No one can say how far his influence has extended, and it has all been for good. It was a happy accident which brought him, while still at the height of his powers, to this country, so that his work is a common possession of Britain and America. These are the two nations which will shape the world's life in the coming age, and Doctor Moffatt has been like a symbol of that spiritual heritage which they share together and in which they will find their strength.

On the Meaning of History

KARL LÖWITH

WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF HISTORY?

LET us assume that we have a common ground in what we mean by history; *i. e.*, world history: the great spectacle of the rise and fall of political powers, the growth and decay of civilizations, human action and suffering. We cannot take it for granted that we have also a common ground as to the understanding of Christianity, though all depends on that when we talk about a "*Christian* view of history." The word "*view*" means less than a philosophy or theology of history, it has an undogmatic subjective flavor. There are so many possible views. Most of the great historians have no religious or Christian view of history. Their viewpoint is political, and in modern times social and economic. The very use of the word "*view*" or "*viewpoint*" implies a variety of possible standpoints, altogether equally possible and none of them simply true. That is what we call modern relativism, and in terms of history historicism.

For the founders of the Church and for the reformers this problem did not exist. The Christian viewpoint was to them not one among others, but the only true one. Their very limited interest in history and even less in comparative history is due to their fixed theological standard of judgment. To Pascal the history of the Church was simply "the history of the truth." Likewise the rationalist of the seventeenth century did not concern himself about history and historic relativity for he believed in a universal and timeless reason. Only in the eighteenth century, with Voltaire, who also invented the term "Philosophy of History," modern historic consciousness began to develop. Voltaire wrote (1756) the first history of civilization, including China, India and America. By giving China as the oldest and most noble civilization the first place, he challenged the last great work of a Christian view of history; *i. e.*, that of Bossuet (1681). He ridiculed Bossuet's claim of a "universal" history within the limits of the traditional Christian view on the pattern of Augustine, which had focused the whole human history on the destiny of the Jews. Though Voltaire dismissed the religious and political interpretations of history, creating the first history of civilization, he did

not become a modern relativist for he believed in the absolute standard of reason over against the passions of wars and religions which seemed to him the two greatest obstacles to progress. Only in the nineteenth century reason itself became involved in historical relativity and historicism became the ultimate standard of judgment, thus elevating relativity to an absolute. If we look at a modern chart of history and compare it with the traditional Christian scheme which prevailed through 1,300 years from Augustine to Bossuet, this amazing change becomes evident. On the basis of such a modern chart it would be quite impossible to organize the history of the world or that of religion from a center called Christianity. There is no spiritual unity at all, only a distracted material universality, held together by the mere chronological framework.

But since we cannot simply discard our modern historic consciousness, we must try to answer the question, "What is a Christian view of history?" historically, by a historic reflection. I mean by this the following: If the stream of a historic movement has become too broad and its waters mixed with too many heterogeneous tributaries one has to follow its course back to the tiny but original source. Cut off from its source the biggest stream would dry up. The primary source of the Christian faith is the life and death of Jesus Christ as it is documented in the Gospels. Jesus Christ has always been conceived as a historic event, but at the same time as a final event transcending the history of the world. This event divides all history into a clear-cut B. C. and A. D. From a Christian viewpoint the Christian epoch cannot but be the last epoch of history. But it is obvious that neither Jesus nor His early followers ever intended to establish Christianity as a historic religion. Christianity was a faith transcending this world and expecting its end. As a historic religion Christianity began to exist only after several hundred years, consciously with Eusebius. History is an abyss into which Christianity only willy-nilly was thrown. It would be absurd to prove the truth of Christianity by its historic expansion and duration. For temporal duration implies also degeneration and eventually cessation. The historic "success" of Christianity can never support its claim of being the eternal truth. As a part of the world and its history established, Christianity became inevitably subjected to the general laws of history; *i. e.*, of growth and decay, of maturity and old age. To rescue Christianity from its historic degeneration, great Christian leaders attempted and achieved time and again reformations. The very fact that Christianity has become an element

in the world's progressive history explains the constant necessity of regressions to its original source: of re-formations, re-orientations, re-interpretations. Taking primitive Christianity as the standard of judgment of all its later developments one may object that this is historicism in the extreme. I would not deny it, but add that by being extreme such viewpoint is once more free from historic relativism for an original source can never be superseded by its historic effects and effusions. Though the New Testament is a historic source, it is a source of faith—not in a progressive betterment of the world, but in the Kingdom of God.

A serious but wholesome consequence of accepting genuine Christianity as the criterion of a Christian view of history may be that we have to confess that we are not Christians, but citizens plus Christians with two flags of equal size in the Church. We are Christians only up to a certain (very uncertain) degree but not undivided and radically. Since most people are unable and unwilling to surrender their own will radically, it seems to me an excellent thing that the Catholic Church has maintained monastic orders, setting an example of a comparatively radical self—and world—renunciation. It is no accident that whatever the Church has produced of spiritual greatness and effectiveness between the fourth century and the Reformation came from the training and the discipline of the cloisters. These men knew much more of man and the world than our modern educationists who are so fond of "life situations." Though it is true that Christians stand for something in a secular world, they can only stand for something insofar as they are not of this world. The immense difficulty to live in this world and not to be of it constitutes the heart, the vigor and also effectiveness of Christianity. Only by its contrast to the secular world Christianity has become effective in it. One cannot address the world in the name of Jesus by preaching what the world knows already by itself or by the *Readers' Digest*.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN THAT HISTORY HAS A MEANING?

It is the privilege of theology and philosophy to ask questions which cannot be answered on the basis of empirical knowledge. This does not mean that they are meaningless. All the "ultimate" questions concerning the first and the last things are such unanswerable questions. The most radically ultimate question is the quest for the meaning of life and history. To ask this question earnestly takes indeed away the breath transporting us into a vacuum. Jewish and Christian thinking brought this gigantic question into existence. The ancients were more moderate in their speculation.

To clarify the meaning of "meaning" I will first contrast *the classical and the Christian attitude* to it. The ancients did not presume to make sense of the world and to discover the ultimate meaning of it. They were impressed by the visible order and beauty of the cosmos, and the cyclic movements of the heavenly spheres were to them at the same time the pattern of the understanding of the historic movements. History, too, was governed by the cosmic laws of growth and decay. According to the Greek view of life and world everything moves within eternal recurrences like the eternal recurrences of sunrise and sunset, of summer and winter, of generation and corruption. This view was so satisfactory to them because it was the only rational interpretation of the universe which combines the recognition of temporal changes with periodic regularity, constancy and immutability. The immutable as it is visible in the fixed order of the universe had a higher value to them than any progressive and radical change. Our modern belief in progress and revolution would have struck them as *hybris*, as too audacious and irreligious, defying the cosmic order and fate. Our modern ideas of progress and revolution are still derived from the Christian outlook on history. It was Christianity which had opened this new dimension of dynamic thinking directed toward the future. In the intellectual climate of the Greeks, dominated by the rationality of the cosmos, there was no room for the unique incomparable historic event. As to the destiny of man in history the ancients believed that man has resourcefulness to meet every situation with magnanimity, they did not go further than that.

Augustine questioned their virtues even in their highest aspects of self-sacrifice. Like all Christian thinkers, he assumed that their basic view of eternal cycles deprives life and history of meaning. The circular movement where every movement of advance is at the same time a movement of return was to him meaningless because it has no goal or end. But what means meaning?

To avoid confusion in the use of this term, I propose to reserve the word *meaning* as determined by *purpose* for the Christian view, and the more sensual word *sense* for the classic view. For life and history were, to the ancients, certainly not simply meaningless. They were full of sense, reason and import, though not meaningful in the Christian sense of *meaning*. The Christian thinker presupposes that meaning is constituted by purpose; *i. e.*, by a final goal projected into the future and referring back to a definite beginning. The Christian understanding of history is determined by the final goal of salvation and by its origin

in man's original sin. Between these two superhistorical points of departure and arrival, the whole movement of history becomes progressive (though not indefinitely and by an immanent law), purposeful and thereby full of meaning. Christian theology constructed for the first time a system which gave an ultimate meaning to the whole course of history. This Christian scheme would have been utterly unintelligible to a Greek historian, for none of them speculated about the future or lived in an intensive expectation of it. Greek thinking moved primarily in the presence (of that which always "is," namely present) and all their mythologies and genealogies idealized and re-presented to them their past. We will not find any serious reflections upon future prospects of history in Herodotus, Thucydides and Polybius. They all were quite convinced that future events are predetermined by fate and therefore subject to divination, and that whatever happens will be of the same pattern and character as the present and past events. Yet one cannot infer from this that their view was deprived of meaning. The cyclic movement of the cosmos, reflected in the recurrences of history, was to them the great model of rational order and perfection. Nothing seemed to them more perfect than a self-sufficient circular movement just because it has no beginning and end. Thus the cosmos was to them a manifestation of visible reason and sense. To "make sense" of the world (either by our own efforts or through the belief in a providential design of a Creator-God working out his purpose in history) such an idea never entered the Greek mind. On the other hand, the Greek prejudice for the circular movement as the only true "re-volution" and highest form of perfection was so lasting that even a Christian scientist like Copernicus based his investigations on the axiomatic assumption that the heavenly bodies must move in a circle to conform with divine perfection. But in principle Christian theology definitely abandoned the Greek theory of cycles and the cross replaced the circle. And if the meaning of history is given in Christ, then the whole pagan world was meaningless or at best a preparation to the advent of Jesus.

No transcendent faith but sensual perception and reasoned conclusion conveyed to the Greek thinkers the natural sense and import of the universe, including history. Their attitude is not so much an attitude of moral will, which always wills some purpose, but that of a detached but intensely attentive spectator. They did not judge history like the prophets by moral standards and purposes. They had, however, "pan-

oramic eyes," a youthful curiosity for everything and a keen perception. The Jews from whom the Christian outlook derives have no eyes, they do not see things disinterestedly apart from the interest which they may have for us. They are aesthetically indifferent but profoundly sensitive of ethical issues. To have a meaning means to them to have a moral purpose, over against the visible appearance of things.

THE FORMAL STRUCTURE OF "MEANING"

To analyze its structure we can refer to everything which is what it is not by *nature*, but by being *created*, either by man or by God, to certain purposes. The meaning of a natural tree or a rock is not to furnish material for human buildings, but the meaning of a fabricated chair or of a house or of our whole material civilization is the purpose for which they are created. A chair has its specific meaning in that it indicates or signifies something else beyond its material nature, namely the purpose to sit on it, which is, however, only a purpose for him who uses the chair and not an inherent purpose of the chair itself. But as the fabricated thing usually serves a definite purpose, it seems as if the purpose were inherent in the thing. Actually, however, the thing is only a means to the end or purpose of man, not inherent in but *transcending* the thing. Since a chair has no creative personality, no self, it cannot have a purpose in and by itself: a chair cannot sit on itself. If by an intellectual experiment we abstract from it its purpose it becomes a meaningless combination of wooden pieces. Also to nonhuman beings chairs do not have their proper meaning. To a fly a chair is not a chair because a fly does not sit on chairs, it does not understand its transcendent purpose. The transcendent character of a purpose appears most strikingly if one does not know the proper use of a thing, making therefore a wrong use of it. Thus the meaning of our whole material civilization depends on man's purposes.

If human history is only meaningful by indicating the transcendent purpose of God's will, the same formal structure can be applied to it. But since history is a movement in time, the structure of meaning must be constituted by temporal notions. The purpose must be a *goal*. Single events as such are not meaningful, also a mere succession of events has no meaning. To venture a statement about the meaning of a historical event, or period, is only possible when its *telos*, toward which it was aiming, clears up. Only after a certain time we may guess retrospectively what

has been going on. When a historic movement has unfolded its consequences, then we reflect on its first appearance and can try to determine the meaning of this whole though single event, whole by a definite point of departure and final point of arrival.

The problem becomes more difficult but in a certain sense also simpler if we reflect not upon a single historic movement, but upon the *whole* course of history, being correspondingly concerned with an *ultimate* meaning. This thought is unique to the Jewish prophets and from them derives the Christian theology of history. To the prophets there could be no question of the return of all things in an eternal cycle of cosmic change. The eternal law which the Greek saw embodied in the ordered movement of the heavens was manifested to the Jews in the vicissitudes of human history. Consequently, to the Jews history possessed a unique and absolute value such as no other people of antiquity has conceived. That is true from Isaiah to Marx to whom the chosen people is the international working class. In contradistinction to the Greek speculation about an ultimate principle of the universe, Jewish Christian monotheism is based on a historic consciousness, at first bound up with a national destiny. The strength of this faith in a divine moral purpose in history is one of the most amazing facts of history, for it rose to a climax just when all empirical evidence was against it. When the Assyrian world power conquered the Near East the prophets saw in the material ruin of Israel not a proof of the powerlessness of Jahweh but a manifestation of his universal power in a higher sense. Assyria itself was but an instrument in the hand of God of Israel which would be discarded when his purpose was accomplished. The very calamities of their national history strengthened and enlarged the prophetic belief in the sovereignty of the divine purpose. He who set empires in motion for judgment could use them as well for deliverance. The assumption is that all the forces of history are controlled by one will directed to one purpose. The history of the world is then the judgment of the world.

The formal structure in this view of a meaningful history is simple: it is the final purpose or end which constitutes meaning. Only on the basis of such a *superhistorical*, *i. e.*, eschatological assumption, the problem of history as a whole is answerable at all. Historic processes and changes as such do not bear the least evidence of a comprehensive and ultimate meaning. There has never been and will never be an immanent solution

of the problem of history within itself. Man's historic experience is one of a steady failure; Christianity, too, as a historic world religion was a complete failure. As Nicolas Berdyaev puts it in his study on *The Meaning of History*, the nature of history is such that nothing perfect can be realized in time. Hence, "to situate the Kingdom of God as a solution of human destiny within the historical process itself is tantamount to excluding its realization and even its preparation." But on the other hand, if we had faith like the Jews, over against all empirical evidence, in the concrete rule of God's will and providence, we could easily resign ourselves to understand in each case immediately the meaning of a specific event. We cannot, however, arrive at the conviction of an *ultimate* meaning in a *final* purpose by the mere accumulation of the relative significances of successive events. To sum up: the idea of an ultimate meaning of history implies (1) an ultimate *purpose*, which is by its nature a *transcendent* one, (2) the primary import of the *future* as the temporal horizon for the purpose (the past as understood in Christianity is only a promise to the future but not an everlasting foundation as in the Greek and Roman mythology), (3) *faith as hope and expectation*, for without expectation no future would exist for us. *The ultimate meaning as a transcendent purpose is focused in an expected future.* A Christian view of history is not like the classic history, a disinterested narrative of past and present events centered around a great political conflict. It is based on eschatology. Eschatology, however, presupposes a fundamental dissatisfaction with the historic conditions of our existence. It must be a fundamental one for otherwise it could be silenced by all kinds of philosophical resignation or by humanistic perfectionism. All thinking in terms of an indefinite and immanent progress, and of progressive improvements as to the spiritual condition of man, is inconsistent with a Christian faith in history over against the classic view of the universe.

Faith in human history is, however, only possible by transcending history in both of its temporal dimensions; *i. e.*, toward its beginning and end in creation and consummation, for the last things are the counterpart to the first things. Only because the Christian point of view lies beyond the natural world and its history, can Christianity develop a genuine theology of history on the assumption of an ultimate meaning in a divine purpose.

Translating Hymns for Other Tongues

CARL F. PRICE

ONE of the first concerns of pioneer missionaries in a non-Christian field is to master the language, not only for preaching the message in the vernacular, but also for translating the Bible and Christian hymns for the use of the people. This latter task sometimes involves reducing the spoken language to writing, as the Rev. John Elliott did for the Dakota Indians, finishing his translation of the Bible in 1661 after forty laborious years; as the Rev. Hiram Bingham, Sr., did for the Hawaiians, completing his Bible in 1835; as was done for the Zulus in the Isizulu language after an alphabet had been created for them. The Rev. James Evans, a Methodist missionary in the Northwest, perfected for the Cree Indians a phonetic system of syllabic characters, made his own type from the tin of tea chests and his ink from the soot of chimneys, and then printed gospel selections and some of the hymns on birch-bark paper.

Sometimes the problem involves the creation of a system of type to conform to the peculiarities of native script, such as the Rev. Eli Smith developed for Arabic words in the Eighteen Thirties, making for this purpose 1,800 different pieces of type for the mission press at Beirut. Through almost insuperable difficulties the Bible has been translated into 1,062 different languages and dialects, and it is probable that Christian hymns also have been carried over into most of these tongues.

Translating at best is a precarious task. The hackneyed pun on *traduttore*, the Italian word for "translator" (sounding somewhat like the word meaning "traducer"), has been more than justified by the "betrayals" of language that many a translator has unwittingly perpetrated. In English the greatest success has been achieved in translations from the Greek and Latin probably because, for centuries following the Revival of Letters, scholarship became so completely absorbed in the life and literature of the Greeks and Romans as to comprehend their real spirit. Intertranslation among modern languages, even of the same Aryan stock, has not been so successful, owing to complex differences in spirit between European nations. Such satisfying translations as Lafcadio Hearn's English rendering of the French tale, "The Crime of Sylvester Bonnard," are

the rare exception. Occasionally the result is positively ludicrous. Ambassador Jules Jusserand was shocked to discover that the sentence, "Ils se portrait au théâtre en masse," from his *Literary History of the English People*, had been "betrayed" by a translator into the words, "They carried themselves to the theater after mass." On the other hand, the title of the play, "Hit or Miss," was once "betrayed" into the French phrase, "Frappé ou Mademoiselle." Where one such crass mistranslation is made, there are a hundred more subtle failures to render from one language to another the finer nuances of feeling and thought.

If scholars are constantly failing to reproduce the spirit of one European literature in the language of another, it is not a reproach to missionaries, laboring with Oriental or other languages of a wholly different stock from the English, that they should encounter the most perplexing difficulties, when their special problems are so greatly multiplied.

The first problem of hymn translators is, of course, to find the native word that will bear the exact meaning of the English word to be translated. Doctor Scudder, who spent over twenty-five years in India, told in an address at Rutgers College in the early Eighties that he once noticed during the singing of a translated hymn, "O for a thousand tongues to sing," some of the Brahmins present laughed immoderately. It was so unusual to see staid Brahmins in hilarious mood during worship that he afterward inquired the cause, and found that the native word used for "tongues" meant "chopped meats." The congregation had virtually been singing, "O for a thousand sausages," hence the risibles.

A faulty idiom or the context in translating sometimes distorts the original sense of words, especially if they happen to have a double meaning. Dan Crawford has wittily translated from one of the African dialects into an English pun the Arab phrase for "praying to God": "Locally this formula has become the term for murder, *Tu na kwenda Muunga*, being the double equivalent for 'Let us be off to kill.' It does not often happen that staid old English can hit off such gruesome drolleries, but you have the identical idea when you misspell 'pray' as 'prey'—these devout Arabs do nothing but prey."¹ The translator of a hymn on prayer must be especially cautious in using this phrase.

In China the problem is complicated by the fact that the same word may have two entirely different meanings, according to its rising or

¹ *Thinking Black*, by Dan Crawford. Doran. 1912.

descending inflection. The Rev. Ray L. Torrey, Methodist missionary in Chungking, West China, told the writer of a ludicrous incident, based on the word, "chi," which when given in the lower or level tone means "flag," but in the higher tone, "wife." A missionary, using the wrong inflection, said to a Chinese workman, in effect, "Please lift my *wife* to the top of that flagpole." "*Bugan-dang!*" was the Chinese reply, which meant, "I would not dare!"

A missionary once tried to tell a Chinese boy, "I want some hot water." The perplexed boy did not bring it, until the command was sharply repeated. Then he brought some sugar, and the missionary realized that the wrong inflection had produced the wrong meaning, though the word was the same for "hot water" and "sugar."

Bishop Isaac W. Wiley, while medical Methodist missionary in China, once after his sermon asked a Chinese brother, "How was the sermon today?" The reply came hesitatingly, "The sermon was excellent—but—the people are asking why you said so much about a 'pig.'" The bearing of this peculiarity, which runs through many Chinese words, upon the hymnic problem is obvious. If a hymn containing the word "Lord" is set to a tune which descends upon that word, you are compelling the congregation to sing "pig." Thus the choice of the right word becomes seriously complicated with the question of the right tune, if the real meaning is to be preserved. In fact, this problem is so far from being solved, that it is almost impossible to determine the true meaning of the Chinese hymns from the words as they are sung; the tune changes the sense.

Bishop Ralph A. Ward cites an instance where, in the hymn, "Jesus loves me, this I know," the word for "Bible," demanding a higher tone, and the word for "tells," calling for a lower tone, are both forced by the melody to use the same tone, thus changing the meaning of "Bible tells" into "Bible carries," as with a carrying-pole.

In *Chinese Heroes*, Dr. Isaac T. Headland relates that the wife of Wang Ch'eng P'ei (a preacher, martyred by the Boxers) once heard the hymn:

Ye who seek the throne of grace,
Do not delay.

But the words for "delay"—"ch'ih yen"—also mean in another tone "use tobacco," and she understood the lines thus:

You who seek the throne of grace,
Do not use tobacco.

Immediately she threw away her pipe and tobacco, and began a crusade against the horrid weed among her neighbors.

By the same token, W. E. Soothill was once astounded to hear a passage from Saint John rendered, "I am the Vine, ye are the *gimlets*," as he tells us in *A Typical Mission*.

The Chinese are the only great section of the human race who place the first emphasis on the inflection of the voice and the secondary emphasis on accent or rhythm when transmitting ideas vocally. If one can read characters, there is no problem, but the vast majority of Christians can neither read nor write. There is a kind of poetry called "tz'u" (詩詞) which has taken into account the inflection of each word and established therewith some beautiful verse tunes by the exaggeration of the inflections associated with the words. During the recent past, the national language for all China has been established as the "Kuo yü"—very similar to the Pekingese dialect; so that in another generation any Chinese with a slight education will be able to speak a universally recognized dialect. The new union hymnal, *Hymns of Universal Praise*, edited by Bliss Wiant, is built on this universal "Kuo yü." We are greatly indebted to Doctor Wiant for calling our attention to the use of both the "tz'u" and the "Kuo yü."

Not only the tone of voice, but among some primitive peoples of limited vocabulary the physical gesture accompanying the expression also, affects the meaning of words or phrases. E. H. Richards, in building a written language for the Sheetswa in Africa, found that a man of that tribe, when hungry, said, "I feel a famine," placing his hand on his stomach; when greeting a long-absent friend, "I am split to see you," grasping his hands and jumping up and down. The paucity of words for which their boisterous gestures compensate makes translation difficult.²

Meter raises a problem in some mission fields. The Bengali are prone to regard our European meters as ill-adapted for their worship and greatly prefer the characteristic meters of their own poetry. Soothill tells us that in order to hold his Chinese congregations to orderly singing he allowed them to learn only one tune to each meter. Accordingly each hymn in a service must be of a different meter, else—as once occurred—the same tune is sung three or four times in one service. The classical meters of Japanese poetry are found in the Tanka with seventeen syllables

² *Every Man in His Own Tongue*, by Ralph Welles Keeler. American Bible Society.

(5.7.5.) and in the Waka with thirty-one (5.7.5.7.7.). A few Christian hymns employ these, but most of the Japanese hymns are in other meters, quite alien to the classic poetry of that language.

Accent presents another problem. This is not so acute a difficulty in China as in some other lands. English-speaking people are accustomed to putting accent before any other consideration. But, as Bliss Wiant informs us, in compiling his *Hymns of Universal Praise* it was forcibly developed that accent in music, which does not coincide with accent in words, does not bother the Chinese ear (though accents vary considerably: the word for locality, for instance, in North China is "TI fang," while in Central China it is "ti FANG").

In Africa accent is a serious handicap to hymnody. The late E. H. Greeley, author of hymns in Chimany Ka, one of the native dialects of the Bantu people in East Africa, found that the language is most regular in accent (except only where a negative is placed in the middle of a word), but singularly deficient in monosyllables, there being but three or four in the whole vocabulary. Except for these few monosyllables, the accent never falls on the last syllable, as in English hymn lines. The resulting accent in setting words to English tunes is sometimes as absurd, as though we sang "Jesus, lover of my soul" to the tune for "From Greenland's icy mountains." Further, as masculine endings (accent on the last syllable) are almost impossible in that dialect, the last note of each second line in a tune has to be repeated, thus:



Ngoma Dze Chechi ne Chikore Che Sondo (Music for Church and Sunday School), the Methodist hymnal published in Umtali in 1929 abounds in these tunes that repeat the final note; but it has eliminated many of the poor accents and unnatural contraction of words into monosyllables that marred the preceding hymnal, *Ndwiyo Dze Watendi* (Songs for Believers), 1911. Our occidental tunes, thus adapted to the language requirements and the fondness of the nationals for many slurs and counter-melodies, sound so different from our own usage that a new missionary in that field, hearing them sing the tune "Dennis," exclaimed: "Either they or we sing it incorrectly!" This incident was related to the Hymn

Society in 1942 by Mrs. L. N. Murphree, Greeley's hymnic successor in that field. No rhymes occur in African hymns, owing to the paucity of the vocabulary, and the hymns are more nearly paraphrases than translations. For the same reason the Long Meter Doxology, four lines in English, demands eight lines in the Chimanyika dialect.

This lack of compressibility of ideas into few syllables suggests the metrical difficulty of hymn translators, by no means confined to Africa. The Rev. A. E. Chenoweth, for years in the Philippine Islands, states that the five-syllable English phrase, "Faith of our fathers," is translated into Spanish by the words, "Fe de nuestros padres," but when carried into the Tagalog language demands sixteen syllables, "Ang pananampalataya nang ating mañga magulang."

Limitation of vocabulary, especially in moral and spiritual terminology, is a bugbear to the hymnist. The word for "holiness" in some dialects of India means "merely the condition of one who has recently bathed in a sacred stream,"³ while among Mohammedans "divine mercy" is merely "the favor which God shows to the Moslem, because he is a Moslem." Moravian missionaries in New Guinea, translating the Lord's Prayer into Papuan, found that the verb "art" could be represented only by "sittest"—"Our Father, Thou sittest in heaven"; that with no word for "kingdom" they must use the phrase for personal ruler—"Come, Thou Chieftain great"; "Thy word" for "Thy will," "spirits" for "heaven," and "all men" for "earth." For the negative idea of "temptation" they must substitute the positive phrase, "show us a good way." In the Philippine Islands "ang culay nang" or "the color of the sweet potato" is the word for "purple." Imagine the perplexity for the translator of Katharine Lee Bates's "O beautiful, for spacious skies," with its colorful line, "For purple mountain majesties."

Sometimes even circumlocution cannot repair the verbal deficiency, and entirely new words have to be coined, as the first missionaries to Hawaii did, introducing "such foreignisms as 'evangelico' for gospel, 'anela' for angel, 'daimonio' for demon, 'ekalesia' for church, 'bapetizo' for baptize, 'lepero' for leper, 'himeni' for hymn and 'halelu' for psalm."

There has been in the past a bitter philological dispute among missionaries in China as to the correct word for "God"; some insisting that "Shang Ti" (or "Lord of all") should be used; others, that "Shen" (or "Good Spirit") is preferable. The former is used in *Hymns of Uni-*

³*Ibid.*

versal Praise, and the term "Chu" for Lord. In Japanese the word, "Kami," is used for various mythological deities and ancient heroes; but missionaries use it for "God" as the best available term. In Madagascar the Malagasy expression for "God" literally means a "supreme spirit" or "a local guardian deity."

The lack of words is no problem in translating into the Chinese language, which is rich in ideas and shades of meaning. One exception may be noted. The lack of a term for "fellowship" was supplied by T. T. Lew of Yenching University in "T'uan Ch'i." The symbol of the cross meant the figure "ten" to a Chinese; so that the "ten-word framework" three characters are used to express that symbol. Chinese hymns all rhyme and are metrically exact, using one syllable to each character. Sometimes one character represents twenty different ideas, depending upon the context. This gives rare play for poetic license. Chinese officials have taken advantage of the possible ambiguity of meaning by issuing edicts which to the populace looked like abject apologies, but to scholars bore quite the reverse meaning. Translators into Chinese must be wary of many pitfalls, and their task demands a thorough knowledge of that tongue.

Bishop Ralph A. Ward tells of a visitor to China, who addressed an audience through an interpreter, and quoted a hymn, usually a dangerous venture under those conditions. The skilled interpreter, however, turned his ideas into such an excellent Chinese hymn that the audience marveled. Afterward he wrote it down and it became a popular hymn.

One of the happiest achievements of the hymn translators has been the repainting of phrased pictures to conform more closely to the native imagination. A few instances will suffice to illustrate. A hymn, introduced into Japan from America some years ago, bore the refrain, "He's the lily of the valley, the bright and morning star." The translator happily added the figure, "He's the cherry of the mountain peak," as better suited to stir the Japanese imagination, and in this form the hymn has become very popular. Bishop Raymond J. Wade, whose Methodist Episcopal Stockholm Area included a number of churches within the Arctic Circle, stated that in using the song, "The little brown church in the dale," they have made changes as a concession to the taste of Norway, where the churches are all of them white, not brown, and are set upon hilltops and never in dales. Accordingly, they sing the hymn in this fashion, "The little *white* church on the *hill*."

In China the phrase, "the fields are ripe," is rendered in Bible and hymns, "the rice is ripe," as being more intelligible. In the hymn, "Jesus loves me, this I know," the line, "Little ones to Him belong," is rendered, "To all children the Lord is a shepherd." The Apostles' Creed contains the phrase, "on the right hand of God the Father." In China the left hand is superior to the right, and so the phrase is rendered into Chinese, "on the *high* side of God the Father."

In an earlier age, when the terror of sinners was stirred by sulphuric hymns on the fires of hell, it is said that freezing congregations in Greenland refused to be terrorized by the imagery of excessive heat—the prospect was too beatific; but what was the hymnic alternative in this case has never been disclosed.

In the *Sgaw Karen Hymnal and Tune Book*, Rangoon, 1909, the translation of the verb in "He leadeth me" used the word, "She(r)," which bears the idea not only of "show me the way," but also of "accompany for companionship"; so that this Karen hymn has become more significant to the missionaries than the original English. A Spanish translation of this hymn begins with "Me pastorea"—"He shepherds me"; and "His faithful follower I would be" is given as "Anhelo ser"—"Thy sheep I'm anxious to be."

Basil Mathews gives this literal retranslation back into English from the version in the Sechuana language in Africa of "Jesus loves me, this I know"—"Yesu oa me oa nthata":

My Jesus loves me;
He has paid my debt;
He has brought me back from where I strayed;
He has washed my heart.*

Heber's missionary hymn, "From Greenland's icy mountains, From India's coral strand," is rendered with a great variety of geographical adaptations on various mission fields, as is shown by retranslations back into English. President Lin Gao Dsang of the West China Union University has retranslated it from the *Union Chinese Hymnal*, Foochow, 1915, thus:

From Mongolia up in China
Down to Assam, Japan, India and all the world.

In the *Sgaw Karen Hymn and Tune Book*, Rangoon, 1909, the hymn begins with these lines:

* *The Book of Missionary Heroes*, by Basil Mathews. Doran.

From the top of Siam's great mountain,
Clear down to Burma's country.

(Retranslated into English by the late Rev. Sumner R. Vinton.)

One of the two versions in *El Nuevo Himnario Evangelico*, 1914, a collection for use in South America, renders the couplet thus:

From the Himalaya mountains,
From the frozen Pyrenees.

(Retranslated into English by Mrs. Esteban Andino.)

In the Hindustani *Gīt Ki Kitāb*, Lucknow, 1911, it is rendered:

From the cold land of Greenland,
And also from India and China,
And from Africa, where
The springs give freshness.

(Retranslated into English by the Rev. H. R. Ferger.)

In the spirit of the more figurative style of Japanese poetry, these geographical names do not appear in the version used in *The Hymnal* (Japanese), Tokyo, 1912:

From far-north icy mountains
To sun-drenched, sandy meadows
A voice resounds, crying for help,
Saying, "Loose our chains of error."

(Retranslated into English by the Rev. Dr. Charles W. Iglehart.)

Retranslation of hymns into the original English often reveals many adaptations which have been made in the first translation. At my request a Chinese student at Columbia University made a number of translations into English from a Chinese hymnal. The second quatrain of "Jesus, lover of my soul," beginning, "Hide me, O my Saviour, hide," came back into English thus:

I only hope my Lord is willing to receive and shelter me,
To save me out of danger, to give quietude,
To lead me safely to the heavenly village;
I hope that in the Last Day He will receive my soul.

The New York Times once printed a student's retranslation of "Rock of Ages" from Hindustani into English, which illustrates the perils of this method, due to linguistic deficiencies:

Very old stone, split for my benefit,
Let me absent myself under your fragments.

Retranslation may thus utterly spoil the hymnic quality, but at least it discloses what modifications have been made, during translation, in its ideas and imagery.

President Dsang gave us the following retranslations from the *Union Chinese Hymnal*, Foochow, 1915, exhibiting the paraphrasing that is often necessary in carrying hymnic thought from English into Chinese:

Abide With Me

When night comes, everywhere it is dark.
 The Lord of Glory must protect and take care of the world.
 All that the world trusts is empty.
 We hope Thy grace of Salvation (is) to be with us.
 At the end of (our) time we hope the Lord will come, Himself,
 Change the darkness into brightness and lead us to heaven:
 The glory of heaven (will be) manifest, the falseness of the
 world displaced.
 No matter, life or death, we hope the Lord will live with us.

My Faith Looks Up to Thee

Sinners, looking up to the holy Lamb,
 Will remember the great merit of the Lord for His death.
 The Saviour is the most holy Hope:
 The Lord will answer our prayer,
 Clean all our sins and receive
 And keep us from now on.
 Thy commandments will be obeyed.
 Pray the Lord, give us Thy great mercy
 And feed us (who are) the small and weak people.
 Help us to thank Thee, Lord,
 (Who) wast willing to sacrifice to save me.
 I'm willing to thank the Lord for His great graces.
 Help me to have pure and warm heart for long.
 Like the fire we will not be stopped.
 The world is dark, everywhere we step,
 Everywhere there are many calamities,
 Pray the Lord to lead us,
 Make the darkness change into glory.
 Wipe the tears from my eyes.
 Deliver me out of the bitter ocean.
 Be embraced by the Lord.

How certain phrases, objectionable to nationals, can be avoided, may be seen in his retranslation of the hymn:

From Greenland's Icy Mountains

From Mongolia up in China
 Down to Assam, Japan, India and all the world,

All the people's hearts are disquiet.
 They are lacking too much of the truth.
 The grace of the heavenly Father and His great love
 Will breed and protect all the people.
 But (we are) sorry that the people do not worship Him,
 But worship the idols.

I become a disciple of Jesus,
 I understand thoroughly the salvation of the world.
 I feel pity for the people and teach them
 To surrender to and obey the heavenly Father.
 The gospel is preached to the remote corners of the ocean
 To make the people, near and far, to hear
 Under the heaven, east, west, north and south,
 (Till) all the people believe and worship the name of the Lord.

The most popular translated hymn in Japan is Bishop Heber's "Holy, holy, holy." The word for "Holy" in Japanese has four syllables, "Se-i-na-ru." This and other instances of the same thing make necessary the repetition of notes in some places of Doctor Dykes's melody to this hymn. The Rev. Dr. Charles W. Iglehart has made the following retranslation into English:

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty
 Holy! Holy! Holy! God, Three-in-one,
 With our early morning rising let us give
 Adoration to the name
 Of God, the Three-in-One.

Holy! Holy! Holy!
 Angels, casting down their crowns,
 Bow before God:
 His messengers also praise His name.

Holy! Holy! Holy!
 Though invisible to sinful eyes,
 Unequaled is the glory of God,
 Who is filled to overflowing with love.

Holy! Holy! Holy
 Are all the works of Thy hand;
 Let us give praise to the name
 Of God, the Three-in-One.

One stanza of "I have found a Friend in Jesus" (Lily of the valley), he has retranslated from the Japanese, as follows:

To what shall I liken the beauty
 Of Jesus, my Lord, for whom my soul is thirsty?
 To the cherry of the mountain peak
 Or to the lily of the vale.

My consolation in pain,
My friend in the day of loneliness,
Thou, my Lord, art the lily of the valley,
The cherry of the mountain peak;
In all the world there is no one
To compare with Thee.

All of these problems of translation are multiplied many times by the diversities of language encountered in the various fields. In India there are 141 dialects. While practically all are based on the Sanskrit with common characteristics of pure, resonant vowels and clear-cut consonants, still their dialects are mutually unintelligible among fifty different peoples in India. In Africa the languages and dialects number at least six hundred. In China the diversities are not so great, but have caused the preparation of hymnals in twelve different dialects. Until recently, there were two schools of hymnists in China: one, of the classical language (Wen Li), known to scholars only, its rhymes and rhythms being only those sanctioned by tradition; the other, of the colloquial "earth-language," almost slang, known in its several varieties to the man-in-the-street (not to be confused with the official colloquial Mandarin or Kwan Hwa). Hymnals have appeared in both styles. Doctor Goodrich prepared a hymnbook in Easy Wen Li, modifying the classical rhymes and rhythms. This could be used almost everywhere in China and Manchuria, except in Shanghai, Foochow and a strip of the coast running down to Indo-China.

Hymn translations from English into Japanese are notoriously inadequate, as the verse form usually allows only one thought for each stanza, and original ideas in English sound trite when carried over into the Japanese, as Howard D. Hannaford has set forth in *The Japanese Christian Quarterly*. These serious limitations in translation have spurred the quest for new hymns written in Japanese. In some instances such radical paraphrasing has marked the translating, as to produce what has been regarded as a better hymn than the original English hymn.

Thus through difficulties varied, but challenging, the work of carrying the thought and emotions of our rich English hymnody into foreign languages is constantly progressing; and there is abundant evidence that an improvement in the technique of translation is reproducing more faithfully than before the spirit of our Christian worship song in the hymnals of the Younger Churches.

What Can We Learn From the Cults?

CHARLES S. BRADEN

THE "we" of the question which serves as the title of this article refers to the so-called "regular" churches, in contrast to the "sects" or the "cults": those religious organizations that differ in some rather marked respect either in faith or in practice from those which are accepted as the normative expressions of the majority religious groups of our time. The cults are the minority religious groups. Another way of stating the question might be: "What can the majority religious groups learn from the minority groups?" The answer is in general that there is much they can learn. Point is given to the inquiry by the fact that at present many of the so-called cults are flourishing, while a number of the "regular" churches are barely holding their own or even losing membership and a part of the loss, though by no means all, is to the cults themselves.

Obviously, since the cults differ so among themselves, we cannot learn equally from all of them. From some of them we can undoubtedly learn negative lessons of great value. They provide an excellent demonstration of what not to do. On the other hand, a careful sympathetic study of some of them will reveal much that is of value, which, if incorporated into the life of the "regular" churches, would greatly increase the effectiveness of their ministry to the needs of men. The most fruitful approach is to observe what are the dominant needs to which each ministers particularly, and the way in which they go about meeting the need. This approach rests on the conviction that religion exists in order to satisfy man's deepest needs. It is man's method of achieving the highest values of which he can conceive. When the particular form of religion to which he adheres fails to provide the satisfaction of his needs and aspirations, he is likely to seek their satisfaction in some other form. This gives the minority groups their opportunity, and it may well be said that their growth is a fair index to the effectiveness with which the "regular" churches are meeting the deeper human needs. The fact is that people do not readily change from one church to another, even among the "regular" denominations, though much more readily in recent years than before. The rapid shifting of population due to the war has speeded up the move-

ment among the denominations, since frequently no church of their own denomination is near where a family settles, and they are likely to go to one conveniently located. The old days of sharp denominational differences is happily passing.

But it is not so easy to join a minority group, even when it may be the one most conveniently situated. Many of them are not well equipped or well situated. They are frequently in out-of-the-way places, and quite lacking in attractiveness. And rather than social prestige there is much more likely to be something of social disapproval attached to membership. Hence people do not readily seek out the cults, unless they have a strong reason. If they become convinced that a given group can afford the satisfaction of some very deeply felt need which is not being met in their own church, then they may be willing to accept whatever disadvantages may accrue to membership in a cult.

A study then of the appeal which the various cults make may suggest areas which are being overlooked or minimized by the "regular" churches. If these are legitimate needs and it falls within the scope of the Church to minister to them, then wise church leaders will seek to discover the most effective way in which such needs may be met. To the discussion of some of these areas we shall return later. Let us first look at some rather general things which the cults have to teach us. While not all the cults exhibit in equal degree the qualities which we here mention, they are generally to be found more prominently within the cults than in the "regular" churches.

1. I note first that, in general, cult members seem to have a definiteness of conviction concerning their faith, that is all too often lacking among the members of the conventional churches. If you ask a member of a sect or cult what he believes, he can and usually will tell you. Indeed he will not wait for you to ask him, if you give him half a chance to witness to his faith. But try asking the average member of one of the majority churches. There are those, of course, who are quite able to give a good account of what they believe and stand for, but I am comparing the average of each group. The answer that you will get will generally be vague, hesitatingly given, and will carry little conviction.

Why is this so? Partly it may be explained by the fact that, generally speaking, the sects or cults are narrower in their interests. They are likely to concentrate attention strongly upon one or a few chief ideas. These are repeated over and over. They are likely to be oversimplified

also, and so have a definiteness of statement which it is not so easy to achieve where the interest is broader. A difference may be noted here between the liberal and the more orthodox type of belief. The latter lends itself more readily to concise, dramatic statement than the former. It is more stereotyped in its typical expression. Yet the average member of the ordinary orthodox "regular" churches does little better, if any, than the liberal, in comparison with the average cult member.

But there is another reason, one which may well be taken into account by the "regular" churches, particularly the more liberal ones. It is that the cults hold that it does definitely matter what a person believes. It may well be true that they place undue emphasis on belief, that they limit unduly the meaning of the term belief to intellectual acceptance, rather than to wholehearted commitment of the life to that in which they profess to believe. Nevertheless, psychologically they are right. It is important to have definite beliefs. To be sure beliefs are to be tested by the fruit which they bear in actual living. That is a test as old as the teachings of Jesus, for did he not say, "by their fruits ye shall know them?" But to say, as is so often done, that it really doesn't matter much what one believes so long as he behaves himself and treats other people with a decent regard for their feelings, is to err greatly. For activity ultimately roots in what one believes. One can be taught to act in accord with customary morality without the support of any undergirding convictions with reference to the moral nature of the universe or the judgment of God upon sin and unrighteousness, though even here, the failure to base conduct upon some such ground is really an expression of the belief that society does determine what is right and what is wrong. But what happens when serious problems arise, when he is faced with new situations for which he has not been provided the answers? Then it does matter profoundly what he believes about the basis of living, whether there is something beyond society to which he is obligated, something which at times may compel him to defy the majority opinion of the society of which he is a part.

There is something fine about the practical ethical teaching which has been characteristic of modern religious education. The emphasis upon actual life situations, the earnest attempt to find the "Christian way" through the maze of perplexing problems which face children and young people, not to say the adult Christian, in the terrible period through which we are now passing is nothing short of admirable; but one wonders whether, often enough, the result of the quest has not miscarried because

there was not a sufficient basis of knowledge or understanding of the basic Christian beliefs which properly underlie any "Christian" solution of the problems. Religious educators are, many of them, conscious of this, and there seems to be a tendency among them recently to emphasize more strongly the content of belief. There is a wholesome desire on the part of many to give a larger place to the Bible than was true in the earlier phases of the modern religious education movement, without sacrificing the values in the "child-centered curriculum." This is all to the good. Surely none of us want to go back to the old days of a wholly "Bible-centered curriculum," or to the learning of the catechism in the deadly way in which some of us who are older learned it; but to get deeply fixed in the minds of our growing children and youth some great convictions which have been tested by the ages, and then to develop skill and capacity for the practical application of these basic convictions to the problem of living in a changing and complex world is a thing greatly to be desired and worked for. The cults can certainly teach us the desirability of holding some great definite convictions.

2. A second thing which we can learn from the cults is "to witness" to others of the faith that we hold. Of course, there is nothing new about this. The cults didn't originate it. It began in Christian history with Andrew who "found first his brother Simon," and with Phillip who "findeth Nathanael and sayeth to him, 'We have found Him.'" That has been a normal expression of the Christian Church in one form or another throughout its history. It is still practiced in some of the denominations. Generally, they are the ones that are growing most rapidly. But it must be confessed that it is chiefly among the cults and sects that it will be found practiced most assiduously today. That is one of the reasons why they are growing. They not only hold convictions as stated above, they actively and persistently witness to them in season and out of season. Some churches emphasize the element of witnessing during special seasons of revival. Among the sects, particularly the revivalistic sects, there is an attempt to maintain a perpetual state of revival, and witnessing is one of the major phases of the revival.

It is easy to find fault with the particular form which "witnessing" takes among some of the groups. Often it is loud, repetitious, hollow-sounding, stereotyped. Sometimes it is clearly a bit of exhibitionism which does little to commend the faith to which it witnesses. Sometimes it is obviously forced and does not flow spontaneously from the witness.

But when all this is said, it still remains true that there is no one thing which so disposes one to accept a faith as the sincere witness of one who holds it. Probably more people have been won to the Christian faith by the witness of some who hold it than by any one other means. Argument probably convinces or wins very few. The personal testimony of one who can say out of a deep personal experience, "this, Christ has done for me," or "this the Church means to me," or "this, worship means to me" is powerful in its influence upon those who hear it, particularly upon those who know well the witness.

Methodism has been no stranger to "witnessing." The oldtime class meeting, the prayer meeting, were occasions when those present shared their experience, and witnessed to what "the Lord had done for them." These seem to have passed in the majority of Methodist churches. Perhaps it is just as well. They rarely reached those who were not already of the fold, because such folk rarely attended them. They tended to become rather formal and stereotyped. One knew what Brother So-and-so would be likely to say—he had said it so often. But that is only one form of witnessing. Witnessing can be quiet, it can be restrained, in good taste, never objectionably forced upon an unwilling listener. It can be a highly personal matter, and in so doing become perhaps much more powerful than the public witness to which objection is made. Witnessing must be done in keeping with the times in which it is done. Regard must be had for the way people feel and react in a given period, it must accommodate itself to the particular type of person or group in which the witnessing is done.

Witnessing is in its essence just the generous sharing of some good which one has experienced. Because I have found it to be good for me, I want it to be shared by others I know. I therefore tell them what has happened to me. I do not force it upon them. I do not compel them to accept it. I can't do that, even if I wished to do so. Witnessing is at its best quite spontaneous. There are few of us who do not at times spontaneously share with others what we have found to be good. We have read a good book. We have seen a good play, heard a good program, found a satisfying shaving device, a good hair dresser, etc. Just naturally we pass the word along to those whom we know. Why not also some great spiritual experience which we have found enriching?

But witnessing is definitely emphasized among the cults as it is not any more among most of the greater churches. One has a duty to witness.

He may not want to. He may not like to. But it is his duty. "He that confesseth me among men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God, but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of the angels" (Luke 12:8).

Undoubtedly this can be overdone, and the result may easily be a forced, unreal testimony. Yet, would it not be wise for our churches to stress the value of witness and the obligation of the Christian to share the good which his faith brings him, all of course within the canons of good taste, so long as his witnessing is genuine and expressive of his inner experience. To be sure the most effective witness is undoubtedly that of a good life, and we have done well to stress that fact. But sometimes, to the witness of daily living, ought there not to be added also the quiet word which discloses the source of the successful living which may not always be known? Ought not Christians and church folk to seek to bring others to their faith and to their church if these have meant so much to them. Surely in a day of blatant advertising in which for profit men seek by every means, legitimate and otherwise, to bring their product to the favorable notice of the public, Christians ought not to feel any hesitation about voicing, always in considerate ways of course, the values of their Church and their faith.

First of all, of course, we must have something to which we can truly witness, but having this, the cults surely teach us, or at least remind us of the value of witnessing tirelessly to their faith.

3. The third thing which the cults in general may teach us is a comparative indifference to public sentiment in the pursuit of the values they seek through religion. That is of course a mark of minority groups. They are not afraid of doing the unconventional thing, if through that means they attain the satisfaction they are after. One of the great forces tending to reduce us both religiously and otherwise to a relatively similar pattern of behavior is that of convention. We cannot stand to be different. We lift the eyebrow, we shrug the shoulder at those who dare to express themselves in unusual ways. We desire social approval. In thus limiting ourselves to what society approves, we undoubtedly are inhibited from doing and experiencing things which might greatly benefit ourselves and the world around us. The great creative figures in the history of religion have almost utterly defied convention. No prophet fits any mold. Paul could be a fool for Christ's sake. The great dynamic periods in the history of the Church have been times when convention has been

set aside and men have dared to say and do what they felt impelled to do by the power of the spirit of God. This is no plea to do what the cults do; much of that may well be the wrong thing. It is a plea for the established churches to rid themselves of the strangle hold of convention, and to act fearlessly regardless of what the world may think of them.

4. Closely related to what has just been said, and applying to a great many, if not all, of the cults or sects, is the fact that membership in them means definitely setting oneself over against many of the current beliefs and practices of the "world." There are things which members do or do not do which distinguish them from the ordinary run of the surrounding society. Sometimes they choose what seems to some of the rest of us not very important as the criteria by which they are distinguished, and more often than not the criteria are negative rather than positive. But the point is that membership does mean something definite. Members do accept definite obligations, and you can with only a little observation tell that they are different from the "world." Is this generally true of the members of the greater churches? Is it easy to tell the difference between a nonchurch member and one who belongs to the church to which you who read this belong? Are they in any way distinctive in what they believe, or, perhaps more importantly, in what they do. Obviously there are some members of every church who do maintain a standard of behavior distinctly above that of society in general. But can the average of our members be distinguished from the world about them?

In our desire to increase our membership do we always make it plain to those whom we seek to bring into the Church that church membership does mean something real? That it does signify maintaining a moral and spiritual level above that of the world outside? Undoubtedly, some of the sects have hit upon some comparatively unimportant negative criteria as their chief distinguishing marks. But they do have marks, and they will not accept as members those who refuse to accept them. I recall an experience related to me recently by a Methodist pastor. In a certain church, classed as one of the sects, there was a young woman member who fell in love with a young man in the armed services. He went to church with her. He became interested. He wanted to join. He went to the pastor and talked with him. He answered satisfactorily all the questions with reference to belief that were asked him. Then he was asked concerning his habits. They seemed to be exemplary until he was asked finally: "Do you smoke?" "Yes," he replied, "I do." "Are you

willing to give up the habit?" he was asked. He thought a long while about it, then answered, "No, I do not believe it is wrong, and I do not want to give it up." "Very well," said the minister, "then I think you would not be happy among us, and I cannot accept you. But the Methodist church would take you. Let me call my friend, Dr. So-and-so—the man who told me the story—and you go over and talk to him."

Please do not take it that I am urging this particular mark of a church member as desirable. My point is simply that some churches do have distinguishing marks that do set them off from the rest of the world. Membership means something specific. I sometimes wonder if people do not refuse to join the church simply because it does not seem to mean anything. Apparently, certainly by average standards, they would be no different if they were in the church. Therefore why join?

Negative criteria are easier to set than positive. Card playing, theater-going, dancing, etc., are obvious, and certainly are not at all adequate as measures of what being Christian means. What if the churches were to set up some definite, challenging, positive requirements for membership? The first result would doubtless be a great loss of membership. But might not the loss in numbers be compensated for by the effectiveness of the working group that would remain, and might not this result in attracting large numbers of persons who would be challenged by it who are not in the least challenged by the great churches today?

5. Particularly characteristic of a considerable number of sects and cults, the ones which seem to be growing fastest just at present, is the strong sense of urgency under which they operate. What they have to preach greatly matters and it matters *now*. It is true that those that feel this urgency most seem to be the millennial cults. The end of the age is approaching. Armageddon is just around the corner. There is not much time left. Failure to be prepared for the impending crisis is fatal. Eternal happiness or eternal woe is involved. Their whole set of beliefs logically calls for urgency. The time element can be and is dramatized with exceeding effectiveness.

It can hardly be expected that those who are not convinced of the apocalyptic time schedule will feel the strong sense of urgency that these people feel, and it would be a hollow mockery to use their methods without their conviction. But is there not a sense in which it does make a tremendous difference whether or not men follow Christ? Or, really does it make a difference? One could well believe from much of the

preaching he hears that it would be nice if men were to become Christian, but that really there is nothing urgent about it. Surely as one looks at the sorry plight of the world today, torn by hatred and strife, and facing, unless some powerful forces are brought into play very soon, an inevitable succession of wars, each more terrible than the last, surely there is something urgent to be said and done by the Church. Here, without copying the content of the cult beliefs, is a suggestion of something that they may very well teach us. If we felt something of the sense of urgency which they exhibit, we may be sure that our message would be more compelling. It is probable that fewer people would be drawn to the cults out of our own rather lukewarm churches.

6. I am impressed, in general, with the large part which the laymen play in the cults, and I suggest that in that very fact lies not a little of their strength. They seem to give their laymen something to do besides attending the public services. Look at Jehovah's Witnesses. One may not like them. He may definitely disapprove of many of their teachings and methods. But they have something. If the same zeal, the same degree of personal commitment, the same willingness to work for the cause and even to suffer bitter persecution for it were to be found in the great churches of the land, what could they not accomplish for Christ. How do they get their literature published in such quantities at such modest prices and how do they get it circulated? Because their laymen, the men who set the type, run the presses, bind the books and distribute them, are all acting in their respective capacities as "Servants" of Jehovah. They have numerous classes of Servants. Some of them correspond to ministers in other churches. It is because they are not recognized as ministers by government and so entitled to exemption for military service that so many Witnesses are in our federal penitentiaries. These Servants serve without wages, or for a mere subsistence wage, for they are serving not men but Jehovah. Surely I need not labor this point. We ought to make a larger use of our laymen, not alone for the sake of the work they could do for the Church, but for the sake of the laymen themselves. When men work for a cause they feel it their own. They develop themselves most in helping others.

7. Most of the cults make a great deal more effective use of the printed page than the churches in general. They get their people to read and to study. Think of Christian Science with its beautifully appointed reading rooms, and the extensive circulation of their literature. And what

is more they get the people to read their books. It is a definite and very important part of their technique for attracting and indoctrinating their membership. Go into any railway station and you are likely to find copies of the *Christian Science Monitor* or some other of their publications to help you while away the period of waiting for your train. Think of the use of the printed page by Psychiana, the mail-order religion, which from a small, little-known city in Idaho sends out literally millions of pieces of printed matter yearly. The head of the movement claims to have distributed twenty-seven million pieces during the last year. Through his national advertising in scores of periodicals he gets the attention of vast numbers of people who never darken the door of a church. In less than seventeen years he claims to have attracted more than a million followers in sixty-seven countries of the world.

Jehovah's Witnesses publish and sell cloth-bound books with colored illustrations containing 300 or more pages for as little as twenty-five cents, delivered right at your door. They have their literature Servants on the street corners of our cities and towns offering for sale their publications, and distributing tracts from door to door. I have already explained above how it is that they can do this. Could such a thing be done in the "regular" churches? Could members of your church be gotten to serve the cause in this way? Here is a point at which the cults have something definitely to teach us. Most of our churches are not doing too good a job of getting the people within the Church to read the books that would build them up in the faith, to say nothing of getting their literature to the people on the outside of the churches.

8. Last of the lessons which the cults in general can teach us is this. Most of them have definite techniques which they practice and which they teach their members to practice, through which they are supposed to achieve the values which the religion offers. I preached a sermon recently on "religion as escape" in which I stressed particularly that religion offers an escape from fear. I made what I thought was an excellent case for the prevalence of fear in the modern world, its evil effects on people, and declared in closing that religious faith is the avenue of escape from much of what inspires fear in men. I modestly thought that for me the sermon was rather effective. Certainly the people had listened attentively and "audience response" seemed good. But afterward, with the disconcerting frankness which an old college friend can sometimes employ, a classmate, whom I had not seen for a long time, but who

happened to be present that morning, said to me: "That was a very interesting sermon. It was certainly true to the facts as I observe them, but Charlie, why didn't you tell them how religion releases men from fear? What they must do, what they must believe. They don't know how to take hold."

That is precisely one of the weaknesses of the ministry of many of the regular churches. We preach glittering generalities. People often do not know where or how to take hold to make effective what religion can undoubtedly do for them. We tell them to pray. We do not teach them how to pray. We tell them to meditate. We do not teach them how to meditate, nor even, often enough, what to meditate about. We tell them to become active in the service of God. We do not tell them what to do, nor, frequently enough, how to do what it may occur to us to ask them to do. We tell them to read. We do not tell them what to read, what books, what articles, what papers, and we do not offer guidance in how or for what to read. We are very deficient in *how* to get the maximum values out of religious faith and practice.

At this point the cults have something to say to us. They are, first of all, in most cases very definite about what they want people to get, and they are quite specific in their instruction as to how they shall go about getting it. I have just recently worked through the lessons put out by Psychiana, the mail-order religion. I undertook to mark in heavy pencil wherever there was specific direction as to what the pupil should do. Almost every chapter contains some heavily marked sentences or whole paragraphs. Here is a sample:

"For the next two weeks I want you to spend fifteen minutes daily, absolutely alone. You will discover later that you will not be alone, but will have as your guest and companion the greatest, most dynamic Spiritual Power there is in the world—the *Power of the Spirit of God*. . . . Quietly read this lesson. Then read it over again. . . . Ponder over it. Grasp the quiet impulse which the Spirit of God will awaken in you, after you have read this lesson just once. Every time you read it, this feeling of deep spiritual awakening will get a little more pronounced. Then through the day, as many times as you can, quietly repeat this statement. If you are where there are others, just let it run through your mind. Here it is: '*I believe in the Power of the Spirit of God.*' Keep this up until your next lesson comes. . . . You must do this faithfully. You must remain in absolute earnest, etc."¹

This is, of course, the technique of affirmation, one widely used particularly by the Christian Scientists, New Thought, Unity, Spiritualism

¹ *Your God-Power*, Dr. Frank B. Robinson, Moscow, Idaho, 1943, pp. 20-21.

and others. Here I am not concerned to advocate this or any other particular technique, but only the fact that people may very well need definite instruction in *how* to avail themselves of the wonderful values which religion affords. Might Protestant Christianity not well study itself at this point and seek to devise definite techniques which would greatly help people in the process of religious attainment? Techniques need not be woodenly followed. They do not and should not be made the only avenues of approach to these values. A large degree of spontaneity must always be allowed for in Protestant religious expression. But many people would be greatly benefitted by a degree of definite guidance in Christian faith and practice. We are already making some decided progress in the area of corporate worship. We have done little for the individual in his own attempt to develop his religious faith.

Space will not permit the mention of everything which one or the other of the cults might teach us. I can suggest only a few without elaborating them. Let me mention first that the healing cults, of which Christian Science is the most notable example, should certainly convince us that religion has a profound contribution to make to the health of mankind. Have the regular churches done well to surrender this interest so largely to science and limit itself only or chiefly to providing hospitals and what spiritual comfort the minister may afford to those who are afflicted by bodily ills? I think not. Of course, we ought not to minimize in any sense or fail to use the techniques of healing which science has made possible. We are not in a position to diagnose the ills of our people. But when science has done all it can, there is still a powerful ministry which religious faith brings to sick folk. So many ills, some of them regarded as definitely physical, such for example as stomach ulcers and some affections of the heart, are greatly aggravated if not actually caused by fear, anxiety, frustration, futility, and all these may be overcome by the ministries of religion. Christian Science, New Thought, Psychiana, none of the so-called healing cults has any monopoly on a faith which can heal. It is cause for deep satisfaction that there is an awakening interest on the part of the Church in healing. The movement to give some training to theological students through an internship in hospitals, mainly mental, is a small step in the right direction, but it is only a first step. It is hoped that we will continue to move toward a more complete acceptance of our responsibility for the physical and mental as well as the spiritual health of our people.

Some cults draw people because they offer them economic security. Has the Church anything to say in this area? Undoubtedly—and it may be freely prophesied that unless we concern ourselves more actively in it than in the past—we shall see even larger numbers drawn into such cults, and what is much more serious we shall see a mounting disregard for, if not active hostility to, organized religion, such as Russia has seen in the rise of Communism, with its violent antireligious program. It is not pleasant to contemplate even now the attitudes of vast numbers of laboring men in America toward the Church and religion.

Some are drawn into the cults from our churches because these have to a considerable degree become class institutions in which those in the lower-income groups no longer feel at home. Some are drawn to them because of the freer type of religious expression offered in their services, and because through such experiences they gain an assurance of salvation and the certainty of their faith which they do not get in many of our churches. Furthermore, they get an emotional release through the music, the shouting, the clapping of hands, the jumping, the rolling, the tongue-speaking, etc., which are frequently found in the more extreme of the emotional cults, that probably meets a genuine need. Others, especially of the more advantaged classes, are able to find the emotional release which in the modern age many of us require, in other, and more expensive forms, denied to people of humbler means.

But to detail all that might be taught us by the separate cults would be to repeat what I have written elsewhere.² I do not mean that we should believe just as the cults do, or do just what they do, but we should take account of the profound needs which their beliefs and practices evidence, and then with great wisdom and skill seek to meet these needs, insofar as they are genuine, in ways which accord better with the general type of faith and practice which are characteristic of the "regular" churches.

We never shall be able to satisfy all the extremes which the cults represent, but if we can measurably well meet the major needs which they satisfy—and I think we can—our people will find no reason to resort to them. The only successful way to meet the challenge of the cults is to provide an equally or more satisfying ministry to the needs of men.

² "Why Are the Cults Growing?" *The Christian Century*, Vol. LXI, pp. 45-47, 78-80, 108-110, 137-140, Jan.-Feb., 1944.

Educating the New England

CECIL NORTHCOTT

HE'S ALMOST bound to be a cabinet minister within a few years, and it may be he's a possible Prime Minister." The speaker was nodding his head toward a slim, dark young man of twenty-two who, on this May evening in 1924, was presiding over the Cambridge Union debate. Richard Austen Butler was then midway in the brilliant academic career which led to a "double first" in French and History and was crowned by a Fellowship of Corpus Christi College. His feet were on the age-old ladder up which his forbears had climbed to positions of authority in the governments of England and India. He himself was born in India, where his father, Sir Montagu Butler, was for many years a distinguished civil servant. Academic attainments and political action have always been well mixed in the Butler family, and Richard Austen, now at 42, in charge of the Educational reconstruction of England and Wales, is a product of that mixture.

When in 1941 Mr. Churchill decided that "educational reconstruction" was to be amongst the domestic "war-aims" of England, he chose Mr. Butler—the nearest parallel perhaps that he could find to the famous Mr. H. A. L. Fisher of 1918—to lead the job. By that time the new President of the Board of Education (it took him just twelve years to reach cabinet rank) had got a pleasant House of Commons manner, and had put in three years' hard work as Mr. Eden's undersecretary at the Foreign Office. He is essentially a Conservative of the Eden school and is high up in the party councils where his handling of the Education Bill and the thorny problems surrounding it have been watched with growing admiration.

He sits in the House of Commons for Saffron Walden. Note the name and place. In the heart of rural eastern England Saffron Walden is the center of spacious farmlands and old market towns. There Mr. Butler himself, at Halstead, is a farmer and a wealthy one, too, for at Cambridge he met and married the only child of Samuel Courtauld, the rayon millionaire. They, with their three boys, like country life, and Halstead is near enough to London for that interweaving of town and country life, land and politics, wealth and culture, church and state

which has produced so many English statesmen in the past. Richard Austen Butler is in the tradition.

If he had been given a free choice he might perhaps have chosen a less prickly pasturage in which to begin his major political farming, than the field of education. Many predecessors had got bogged and tricked in it. But Mr. Butler has ideals and also political sense, and he knew that the main elements in the English education system (Scotland does not come under the Butler Bill) were ready for changes and reorganization. He knew, too, that the ordinary people of England wanted as one of the results of the war "to secure for children a happier childhood and a better start in life." Those are his words, and so, too, is the motto which is written across the explanatory paper to the Bill, "Upon the education of the people of this country the fate of this country depends."

To understand Mr. Butler's problem it is important to keep in mind the two main strains of English education. One is controlled by "private enterprise"—church and religious associations and voluntary bodies of many hues. The other is in the hands of the state through local education committees. The first strain goes away back to medieval England to the monk and the monastery where the light of sacred learning was kept alive in a rough and rude England. Then came the grammar schools in the walled towns where the growingly prosperous merchants of Elizabeth's day sent their sons. If by any chance they had married their wealth into the nobility, the boys went off to the royal foundations of Eton and Winchester, where the classical tradition plus the birch rod produced generations of the governing classes of England. Into this narrow groove came Arnold of Rugby in early Victorian days, the first of the great modern headmasters. He took a small grammar school and turned it into a great "public school" with its ideals of character training, the honor of an English gentleman and obedience to the unwritten laws of "the class." The "old school tie" was born, and the middle classes hastened to pay high fees for their boys to enter the charmed circle of the "public schools." An enormous range of "preparatory schools" sprang up to prepare small boys to enter the greater schools and afterwards to do what every English gentleman of any culture did—spend three years at either Oxford or Cambridge University.

The lower middle classes—the tradesmen, the farmer, the small merchant and the manufacutrer—sent their boys to the local town gram-

mar school, or to one of those institutions for "little gentlemen" which Dickens has immortalized in Dotheboys Hall. The grammar school was usually a day school and lacked the distinctive air which a "boarding school" was supposed to provide, so parents of the "lower middle" struggled and sacrificed to get into the "upper middle" and the sign of victory was the announcement that "my boy is at Rugby, or Harrow, or Uppingham, or Repton or Marlborough." All these schools were founded by independent groups of people, church corporations, and developed by vigorous individual headmasters such as Arnold, and Thring of Uppingham, and their contribution to English education has been enormous.

But it was a contribution to a restricted class of boys. Their sisters were taught at home or in genteel schools for "daughters of gentlemen"—and probably less than ten per cent of England's boys were affected.

In 1870, the state realized that the great mass of England's population was getting little regular education. In the country districts thousands of small schools were maintained by the Church of England, but church and private enterprise were unable to meet the new demands for education in the growing towns and great cities. So the state began to build schools, train teachers and to make education compulsory for children over five. This was called "elementary education" and consisted mainly of the "three r's," and for seventy years it has been the staple diet of seventy per cent of England's children. In huge buildings, often in dismal downtown sections, and in large classes, the "elementary schoolteacher" has labored with generations of children up to the age of fourteen, and has then seen them depart into the maelstrom of industrial life and more frequently into the "blind-alley" occupations of unskilled labor. But "elementary education" signalized the state's entry into English education, and in 1902 it went further. It entered the field of higher education by authorizing "local education authorities" to establish high schools or secondary schools, and in the past forty years the field of higher education in towns and cities has made brilliant progress with first-rate teaching, splendid buildings and fine results in learning and scholarship. The progress in this field has compelled the "independent or public" schools to overhaul many of their ancient and inherited methods, and the products of both systems compete on an equality in the higher realms of university life.

So here was Mr. Butler's problem how to preserve all that is good

in the independent system, and at the same time to provide fuller educational opportunities for every child in the country regardless of birth, status and wealth. Many would have liked him to abolish the "dual system" (as the two strains of English education are called). But he has chosen to maintain diversity, believing that the life of England benefits from a mixture of educational methods provided that every child has the fullest chance of benefiting from the mixture. Here are his words:

"It is just as important to achieve diversity as it is to ensure equality of educational opportunity. But such diversity must not impair the social unity within the educational system which will open the way to a more closely knit society and give us the strength to face the task ahead. The war has revealed afresh the resources and character of the British people—an enduring possession that will survive all the material losses inevitable in the present struggle. In the youth of the nation we have our greatest national asset. Even on a basis of mere expediency, we cannot afford not to develop this asset to the greatest advantage. It is the object of the present proposals to strengthen and inspire the younger generation. For it is true today, as when it was first said, that "the bulwarks of a city are its men."

There are roughly 5,000,000 boys and girls in schools of all kinds in England and Wales between the ages of five and eighteen. Over 4,500,000 of them are in the elementary schools which, under the present system they leave at fourteen, and they are housed in 20,916 schools. The state system provides 10,363 of these schools with 3,100,000 children; the Church of England 9,000 schools with over 1,000,000 children; the Roman Catholic Church 1,260 schools with 330,000 children, and the Methodist Church 119 schools with 15,000 children.

In the field of higher education there are just over 500,000 boys and girls. The "independent schools" ("public" schools) which receive no state aid at all have only 73,000 pupils in them. They number about 400 and vary from the "great public schools" such as Eton and Winchester, to small "residential and progressive" schools maintained by special groups. The great number of "high-school" pupils are in the schools in local communities maintained by the local education authorities and inspected and approved by the Board of Education. They number 1,398 with 470,000 pupils, but 430 of these schools still keep up vestiges of independence with boards of governors operating under ancient charters, with fee-paying pupils, and a modicum of state help. Most of them are the old foundation grammar schools which have found it necessary for reasons of efficiency and equipment to come partially within the state system. They include great grammar schools like Manchester, Birmingham,

Bradford, Bristol, Leeds, Sheffield and Newcastle whose prestige has grown enormously during the last forty years as their pupils going up to the older universities of Oxford and Cambridge have challenged and largely captured those strongholds of the "public-school" and "class" tradition.

A great and far-reaching democratization of English education has gone on quietly during the last forty years, and Mr. Butler is pushing it on many steps farther. It is now easy for, say, Albert Jones, of Bristol, whose father is a railroad man earning twenty dollars a week to proceed without cost to his family to Cambridge by the scholarship system. In his elementary school at the age of ten, Albert passes an examination which takes him to Bristol Grammar School. There Albert is "good" at mathematics and as he goes up the school his masters begin to groom him for a Cambridge scholarship at eighteen. Albert is the bright and shining star of the school and he wins a \$400-a-year scholarship at Henry VIII's magnificent foundation of Trinity College, Cambridge—the home of Newton, Wordsworth, Shelley and Tennyson—to which his school and local education authority add perhaps another \$800 a year. For three years Albert mixes with the elite of Cambridge scholars growing in culture, precision of mind and speech. He wins a "double first" in the great Mathematical Tripos and is starred a Wrangler and Trinity offers him a Fellowship—the blue riband of English academic life. But Albert's mind turns more to public affairs, and he wins the highly competitive examination for the Civil Service, enters the Colonial Office, and at fifty is the governor of a vast stretch of Africa with a knighthood attached to his name, or is the expert head of a great administrative section of Whitehall.

Hundreds of able men in British public life have come the way Albert Jones came by sheer ability of brains and character. The education system has been tuned to produce them. Mr. Butler wants to do more for the seventy per cent of England's children who haven't the academic brains of Albert Jones, but who have gifts and capacities now untapped and undeveloped. He is out to find a new England amongst them—a new England of poets and dreamers, scientists and technicians, philosophers and administrators, a reborn democracy of people educated, intelligent and lively who will know how to handle books as well as machines, ideas as well as airplanes, opinions as well as an engineer's tools. Mr. Butler sees the present time as a time of ferment and upheaval in

English life, and he is politically wise enough to know that the English people are determined to get a "new deal" in educational opportunities out of it all.

So he begins with the babies. His first plank is a national system of nursery schools for those children between the ages of 2 and 5. Under pressure of war conditions over a thousand of these schools have been established to which "war-work mothers" can bring their babies during the hours they are in the factories. The wartime day nurseries have been a grand object lesson to English mothers of the value of these schools where a planned day of sleep, food and play lays a foundation of a happy childhood. Something like 50,000 children are already in these schools, and Mr. Butler is going to make it compulsory upon local education authorities to provide the light and airy rooms for such schools. But he is not going to make it compulsory upon mothers to send their babies, but he hopes that mothers of all classes and all types of homes will send their little ones to these nursery schools of the new England. He knows that nothing stirred the English people more in 1939, when the great evacuations from the cities took place, than the revelations of dirt, disease and untrained habits amongst the "under fives." The country half of England woke up to the appalling conditions in the city half of England where a half a century of social and educational work had plainly not accomplished much. The "nursery-school" advocates—among whom Lady Astor is a leader—have found a warm friend in Mr. Butler, who wants these schools for rich as well as poor families, but especially he wants to see them in the huge industrial sections of English cities where play facilities for little children are so restricted.

From the babies Mr. Butler spreads his new educational layout to the primary and secondary stages. The old word "elementary" is to go. The primary schools will deal with the children up to eleven, and then at that age "classified not on the results of a competitive test but on an assessment of their individual aptitudes largely by such means as school records supplemented by intelligence tests," children will enter one of the new types of secondary schools to be known as Grammar, Modern and Technical Schools. Ultimately no child in England will leave school until he is sixteen, and this new type of secondary, or higher education, is to be available for all and without payment of fees. It is a revolution of major importance in England where for seventy years seventy per cent of the children have left school at fourteen and only twelve per cent

have entered a high school. Welcoming this contribution to the making of a new England the Archbishop of Canterbury said:

"It is now established that what is learnt till the fourteenth birthday and after that is neither studied nor practiced any further is largely forgotten by the twentieth birthday. The return for expenditure incurred up to fourteen begins to come, as regards many aspects of it, after sixteen, and then only if the education has been continued. If raising the school-leaving age were opposed on the ground that we cannot afford it, that opposition would be 'penny wise, pound foolish.'"

Mr. Butler has ingeniously interwoven the old with the new in his new secondary high schools. He retains the name "grammar schools" for the type of school which will still give the Albert Jones's their chance in life, and where something of the classic tradition in learning may be preserved. This will still be the main path to the universities and to academic learning and the great professions. His modern school will provide the general education for the majority of children up to sixteen, but with a curriculum closely related to local conditions and interests. The Lancashire and Yorkshire lads and lassies will learn something of the regional needs and problems of their districts, and the Londoners something of the intricate life of their great metropolitan area. Wales will continue to have schools in which the Welsh language and culture are passed on to the younger generation, and the agricultural regions will have schools equipped to educate better farmers. Diversity of method to meet a variety of needs has been Mr. Butler's motto in recasting education for the new England. He does not want to see a dull, centrally regimented system producing one type of pupil, but locally based, democratic schools which will produce pupils with lively and stimulating differences. His technical schools will be the "high schools" of those children who are going to be the leaders and workers in industry and commerce, and who show an aptitude for the practical and theoretical. No child is to be compelled to stay in one of these schools if his natural bent, one way or the other, changes. He will be able to pass easily between the schools, and especially at the age of thirteen there will be a reshuffling of pupils.

The tyranny of examinations which has brooded over English higher education during the last forty years is at last to be broken. What is known as the "School Certificate Examination," taken by most children in high school at the age of sixteen and conducted by university examining bodies has, in Mr. Butler's view, come to dominate the educational scene unduly and has frozen the curriculum as well as the minds of the pupils.

He proposes to make this examination an internal test in the school conducted by the teachers, and a certificate is to be given each pupil stating his performance, but also giving an account of his whole school record. So with the "Higher School Certificate," at present almost the essential prerequisite for anyone wishing to enter a university, Mr. Butler has struck it out, and recommends a school-leaving examination which will take into account not only examination results but the general record of the pupil. On this examination scholarship rewards and grants will be made toward a university career. Mr. Butler has his eye on the ordinary child and not only on the brilliant, examination-minded Albert Jones's who will get to the university anyway. At present over forty per cent of the students in English universities are there with the aid of grants from public funds. Under the new plan that number will be greatly increased as not only the Albert Jones's but the less brilliant find their way into the universities. It is a further big step in providing more floor space in the top flights of the English educational building.

Mr. Butler's chief argumentative difficulties in piloting his Bill through the House of Commons have been in the realm of the schools still controlled by church bodies, and on the question of religious education. He wants to see the churches still having a big share in the education of the English people but the cost of this to them and other voluntary bodies is enormous. Hundreds of such schools are out of date and ill-equipped according to modern standards. Mr. Butler's standard is high for the children of the new England. So he has made an offer to the churches that the government will provide fifty per cent of the cost for structural alterations to their schools if church managers can find the other fifty per cent. On that basis the school still remains in the hands of the churches with full powers over teachers, curriculum and especially religious education. If the fifty per cent cannot be found then, briefly, the school passes into the control of the local education authority. The churches as a whole, with much misgiving on the part of the Roman Catholic Church, have accepted the offer, and Mr. Butler has added generous provisions for loans to help them meet their financial obligations.

But he has gone further. He has spoken as ardently as any archbishop about the place of religion in education, and of the contribution it has made to English life and character. He says:

"There has been a general wish, not confined to representatives of the churches, that religious education should be given a more defined place in the life and work

of the schools, springing from the desire to revive the spiritual and personal values in our society and in our national tradition. The church, the family, the local community and the teacher—all have their part to play in imparting religious instruction to the young."

So each school day in the schools of the new England is to begin with an act of Christian worship, and the Christian faith based on the Christian Scriptures is to be taught in the curriculum. The churches have worked out a number of "agreed syllabuses" which are already in use in many districts, and their co-operation in doing so is pertinent evidence of the new temper in the religious world. Forty years ago the churches and the government quarreled violently over this very question. Now under the mild and diplomatic Mr. Butler there is co-operative harmony. Always, of course, the "old-established rights of conscience" in this field of religion "remain inviolate" and no child will be compelled to worship or to be instructed in religion against his parent's wishes.

But what about the "independent" or so-called "public schools" who cater independently and expensively for a small minority of English children whose parents can afford a minimum of \$600 a year rising to \$1,000 a year for Eton or Harrow? They do not come within the scope of Mr. Butler's Bill, and they have been under considerable fire of criticism in recent years. They are accused of being homes of class snobbery, hidebound traditions and outworn methods. Many people have prophesied their decay and doom on the grounds that fewer parents will be able to afford the fees, but the contrary has happened. Most of these schools are booming and have lists of those waiting to enter. Parents will still make financial and personal sacrifices to send their children to them. What is their secret? Canon Spencer Leeson, the Headmaster of Winchester sums it up:

"Almost all the 'public schools' are of a religious foundation of one or other denomination of Christianity and have put this right in the front of their work. They also aim at the building up of character by training boys to take part in the life of a closely knit community, and by giving the senior boys under the prefectorial system a large measure of responsibility for running the school."

A group of Labor M. P.'s recently visited many of the schools and came away impressed and delighted with what they had seen. One of them, Mr. George Muff, M. P., wrote:

"We must not destroy; we must extend the privilege of culture and character which these schools have nourished, to the children of the future. All too true the best education has been confined to the few. It must be the heritage of the many."

How to do that is a problem for the schools and for Mr. Butler insofar as he is an unofficial adviser to them. He has appointed a special committee (the Fleming Committee) to suggest ways and means by which the "public" schools may be more closely related to the general school population of the country, and by which their unique contribution to English education may be shared by many more children. Canon Leeson says:

"There has in the past been prejudice on both sides, the defenders of the schools making extravagant claims for them, and the enemies of the schools bringing unfounded charges against them. The 'public' schools believe they have something to offer that is valuable in the eyes of parents and they are eager to offer it. They are equally eager to retain their independence."

Most of the schools are eager to have boys from all sections of English life, and it is probably along the lines of "scholarship awards" that the new system will run. There is widespread desire among English parents that "boarding-school facilities" should be available for all parents who want it for their children irrespective of cost. It is here that the "public schools" which have been built up on the community principle may make a big contribution to the reorganization of English education. At least there is enormous willingness on their part to share their great heritage with a much wider field of English youth.

Schools, Mr. Butler believes, are not only places of learning, but places where children prepare to live. Already the school medical services have 730 doctors and 800 dentists working full time on the health of 4,500,000 children. They pushed up the standard of physical fitness between 1918 and 1939 so that the army doctors were surprised that eighty-four per cent of the 19-20 age-group were placed in Grade 1. In 1918 only thirty-three per cent were placed in that group. Over a million English children in the state schools get their main midday meal at school, usually at a small charge, and over 500,000 children stop at eleven to drink one third of a pint of milk. Mr. Butler proposes to see that these services are carried out in all English schools.

But his ideas for the education and training of the new England do not stop when the child leaves school. They leap on into youth and adulthood. Mr. Butler knows that the devastating weakness of the education that most Englishmen have received is the notion that it begins and ends with school—that gaunt, grim building with the paved playground surrounded, many hundreds of them, with factory chimneys

and mine waste heaps. English "elementary education" has been so elementary that it has produced a race of literates in reading and writing, but illiterates in the finer interchanges of body, mind and spirit. It has failed to impart the zest to learn, and go on learning all through life. There is no easy way, Mr. Butler recognizes, to inject this zest into every citizen, but there is to be no lack of opportunities.

First comes the "Youth Service" based on the registration of young people at sixteen. This was a wartime measure by which all England's youth filled in forms stating exactly what they were doing with their leisure time. There is now a far higher proportion of English youth "associated with healthy leisure-time training and recreation without compulsion or regimentation of any sort." All the youth organizations such as Scouts, Boys' Brigades, Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. Clubs, have increased membership. The wartime organizations of Sea Cadets, Army Cadet Force, Air Training Corps for boys and the Training Corps for Girls have been immensely popular. The smart uniforms and the program of physical and mental education have brought in thousands of English youth who might otherwise be drifting about the streets and adding to the juvenile delinquent problem. Mr. Butler proposes to stimulate the voluntary organizations to develop their activities, and to continue the training-corps units of wartime in peacetime with a great expansion of their educational, social and recreative side of their work. He wants to see the wartime camps of the armies turned into peacetime camps for youth, and alongside them a big program of overseas travel for youth. He believes that in peacetime the maximum hours of work for young people up to eighteen should be forty-four with a minimum annual holiday of twenty-four working days. He knows that education for democratic citizenship must be based on a "variety of opportunities suited to diverse interests to enable young people to obtain the experience of community life, self-government and individual self-discipline." This is his answer to those who have suggested that the government is quietly establishing a totalitarian youth movement which it will control. He admits that the government is entering a new field of enterprise with the Youth Service, but it is to stimulate, advise and provide facilities for existing and also new democratic organizations. The key to this new enterprise is "opportunity and diversity," with an eye always on the individual with plenty of local control of activities. Mr. Butler is no *jugend führer*.

Beyond youth, older young people and the adult, Mr. Butler is comprehensive, and he has cast about him for ideas. He has looked at the famous Folk High Schools of Denmark based on Gruntvig's belief that "whoever is to profit by learning must first have lived a while and paid heed to life in himself and in others, for so only does he get into a position to understand books that describe life." So "local authorities" in England are to set up young people's colleges where the youth of the business and industrial world can come for study and fellowship in a "socially warm" atmosphere, and where they may "learn the things they want to learn." Many of the colleges will be residential, and already some of the country residences of England are being used and many more will be. For those young people in industry who have not yet reached eighteen, attendance for at least one whole day a week in the colleges will be compulsory for forty-four weeks in the year. Mr. Butler's vision is of industry co-operating with education in seeing to it that workers are also intelligent citizens, and that a democratic industrial nation can train a people to think as well as to work. He sees the miner and shop assistant, the clerk and the railroad man, the executive and the farmer meeting and living in the colleges (which will be for adults as well as young people) and creating those lively social and cultural units which have done so much for England's democratic growth in the past. It has been often too true that only the "privileged classes" of birth and wealth have had the opportunities of leisure, travel and cultural contacts which have contributed so greatly to English life and education. That old order is passing. The new England must be a hard-working and hard-thinking country if it is to be a country of true greatness in the modern world. It can no longer rest on its achievements and, in Mr. Churchill's words, cannot carry "drones." It is in this spirit that Parliament has authorized Mr. Butler "to promote the education of the people of England and Wales" and is prepared ultimately to spend \$760,000,000 a year on the task.

Present Trend

TAYLOR E. MILLER

THE mind of the people seeks more and more to grasp the real values for whose survival we fight. This thinking does not spring only from sentimental emotionalism, which is primarily concerned with the waging of the battle, but rather strikes at the future and seems to seek a compensation for the great loss of life and material structure. Perhaps our nearness to the first stage of the World War, after which no final solution was established, is one of the main reasons for this searching. Yet, whatever the reason, it appears we now seek a postwar solution of such fundamental spiritual value, that our striving for military victory will not have been in vain.

Ralph Barton Perry notes the logic of this mood and points out the United Nations' particular responsibility in continuing to participate in the world situation after the war. "In proportion as we shall have created the situation we shall have a responsibility for its settlement. No one knows when the day will come: it may be after years of struggle; it may come suddenly and soon. It behooves us, then, to be mentally and morally prepared to meet that day, and it behooves us to commence that preparation now."¹ Perry is calling the people of the United Nations to a new consciousness of the need for actual contribution toward a harmonious world order and his call stems from a logical, practical approach to the welfare of each nation and each individual. It is a "must" for the future.

What more dreadful tragedy can torment a people than to seek for universal good and plunge into war and chaos? Dante wrote on this theme in regard to his troubled era. In his time, men were in power because of birth and not on the basis of ability. The people longed for peace, but they could do nothing about it since the government did not come from the people. In the democratic countries today, we cannot cast off the responsibility in such a way. The *people* in the United States turned away from the League of Nations in 1919. When Winston Churchill spoke in Congress, he made a particular point of the fact

¹ Ralph Barton Perry, *On All Fronts*, p. 161.

that he could be deposed by a vote at any time, and in a later speech referred to the fact that he was only acting as the servant of the House of Commons. Today, things must be done by the people themselves and they must be prepared to consider any movement that honestly seeks the establishment of a commune that will act justly as the government of all people, by all people and for all people.

The reflecting mind quickly catches the implication in the word, commune. Now we are fighting to preserve our national ethos. What will happen to it in a world order involving all people? The conditioning suggestion of Hans Kohn is most relevant here. He says: "Nationalism is not a natural Phenomenon, not a product of 'eternal' or 'natural' laws; it is a product of the growth of social and intellectual factors at a certain stage of history."²

Thus, the national ethos becomes a contributing factor to the growth of world order. It has played a most important part in the creation of a higher level of civilization, and now it is ready to offer its contribution of culture to the rest of the world. The world garden accepts every variety of flower and is enhanced by the diverse beauties of color offered by each. The process may be long and involved, but if the world view is established in the mind of the individual, the outcome is certain. "If unity of aim and purpose is maintained and if it is inspired by a devotion and earnestness equal to those which the challenge of war has evoked, these objectives can be pursued with confident hope of ultimate success."³

How then can we achieve this aim and purpose? Is any other path open except to seek the spiritual dynamic in the life of the individual and to determine how he makes this dynamic felt through his contribution to the democratic social order in which he finds himself? This dynamic is already contributing to our war effort in quite specific ways. Cordell Hull, United States Secretary of State, says: "Today, while we fight for our liberty, our free institutions and our very lives, we also fight to maintain the principality of peace, which was established on the earth nineteen centuries ago. The presentation of these priceless spiritual forces alone should inspire every person to superhuman efforts against the present world movement of barbarism and savagery."⁴ Likewise,

² Hans Kohn, *World Order in Historical Perspective*, p. 69.

³ Report of the acting Director, *The I. L. O. and Reconstruction*, p. 112.

⁴ Cordell Hull, Press Conference, Dec. 24, 1941.

it should inspire every person to superhuman efforts to create a world order after the victory that will defy any further movement of barbarism and savagery.

It is well to note the effect of this spiritual drive on persons of other localities. The Chinese development in the realm of unity and structural growth has been particularly outstanding during the last two decades. Leadership has been most essential and that leadership has rested in the hands of Sun Yat-Sen and Chiang Kai-shek primarily. Paul Linebarger says that, "each had a Western moral drive, which turned hungrily to the past and justified itself in Chinese antiquity: Sun, the all-around Christian, who professed and denied the churches alternately through life, and Chiang, the Bible-quoting Methodist, both cite the Confucian canons; both esteem the Chinese ethics; both discern the forcefulness of Western spirituality."⁵ These men have caught the vision of the faith on which we have built our civilization and they have put that vision to practical use. Now comes the challenge to the West to live up to its own faith. Kohn declares it in striking terms: "The United States and Great Britain may yet be saved, in their life-and-death struggle against the white and yellow men of Germany and Japan, by the yellow men of China and the black men of Africa, the Indians and the Negroes, the Arabs and the Malays. They will be saved by disenfranchising themselves from the narrowness of their vision, by a new world view and a true catholicity, which will live up to the universal message of all civilization, of Christianity and of democracy. . . . The immense and incalculable danger of the present crisis can only be overcome in a way which justifies an immense and incalculable hope."⁶

In this striking picture we see how interdependent all groups are. If this interdependence is to be workable, it must be founded upon a philosophy of life that is appreciated by all. Alexander the Great attempted to establish such a common philosophy through the imposition of the Greek concept of life, yet this was doomed, in spite of the great influence that it had, by the very manner of its approach. The way of the conqueror will not suffice. Furthermore, the Greek emphasis was on the glory of the state. If we would present a philosophy that will be universal in its influence, we must be careful to define our role as liberator and live up to that definition. Then, if we present a philosophy,

⁵ Paul M. A. Linebarger, *The China of Chiang Kai-shek, A Political Study*, p. 258.

⁶ Hans Kohn, *World Order in Historical Perspective*, p. 269.

such as that which lies behind our own democracy, to cherish the growth of the individual, we may have reasonable assurance of success. In the Christian understanding of life the state exists to benefit all individuals and the community as a whole, as an agent, not of its own supremacy, but of the will of a God in whom there rests a moral law that will not bow to the whims of statecraft. So far from debasing the state, this activity lifts it to an infinitely higher level than does the Nazi deification of the state. For it is greater to be the instrument of the Creator of the Universe, than the despotic apex of a world of serfs. Here there is ultimate value and universal unity, for all become one in a spiritual fellowship that seeks the good of all. The democratic experiment assumed this in its infancy, and now proves it in maturity.

The theory of the state as supreme has been proven false again and again. It is this emphasis which has retarded the development of our various national cultures. Toynbee states the evil when he says that "nationality, which is nothing but a fragment of humanity, tends to set itself up as the whole."⁷ Kohn recognizes that nationality, as such, does not necessarily need to go to such extremes and ordinarily it keeps a proper balance. He says: "Generally this ultimate conclusion is not drawn, because ideas predating the age of nationalism continue to exercise their influence. These ideas form the essence of Western civilization—of Christianity as well as of enlightened rationalism: the faith in the oneness of humanity and the ultimate value of the individual. Only Fascism, the uncompromising enemy of Western civilization, has pushed nationalism to its very limit, to a totalitarian nationalism in which humanity and the individual disappear and nothing remains but the nationality, which has become the one and the whole."⁸

If we, who find ourselves in democratic societies, should allow our democratic nationalism to go to such limits, we would utterly destroy the very essence of our organization. Our own constitutional law is dependent upon trends in the social order, which in turn depend upon individual beliefs. There are power politics, it is true, but only as people are persuaded to react to movements of new purpose. We cannot make a final fascist power out of our nationalism, because we will not allow ourselves to be persuaded to such a purpose. We are a democracy or democracies, because we are citizens, who are able to make such an

⁷ Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, p. 9.

⁸ Hans Kohn, *World Order in Historical Perspective*, p. 102.

organization work. It is not only because we can read and write that we are so able, but because we are all going somewhat in the same general direction of purpose. There is a variety of opinion, but a basic understanding of purpose. The purpose is often assumed as existing where the educational motif has stressed technique, such as our training schools for government service. Yet purpose cannot exist clearly and logically without analysis and affirmation. It should be continually re-examined for education has no center without it. This basic understanding has been brought out particularly in the activity of the United States Government in dealing with other nations. Hornbeck refers to it in his statement that "the United States has but one foreign policy. That policy rests upon, resides in and flows from principles and precedents. . . . It is the product of the concepts, the thoughts, the beliefs, the aspirations, the decisions, the acts—through the years and the decades and the generations—of the American people."⁹

As we recognize that our democracies exist only as the people sustain them, we may look to other nations to examine not only their external form, but also the nature of the people. The steady trend of Russia during the past fifteen years toward a more representative expression by the government brings out an especially good case to examine. Davies and Steiger assert that in Russia "the birth of a new democracy was unmistakable. While some few lingering hostile elements are denied the privilege of equality, millions actually possess and are exercising their rights as citizens with astonishing zeal. The citizens of Soviet Asia are not a leaderless equalitarian mass. Quite the contrary. There are among them leaders directing the masses along the paths of what they call 'socialist construction.'"¹⁰

A study of the people of these different national groups only makes one realize how similar and how closely intertwined they are. To appreciate this we must continually return to our original premise of the integrity of the individual and the fundamental importance of his contribution. "There is no authority now, but the trifling voice of conscience. And what is conscience without fealty to our neighbor? The Chinaman dying in his unseen mountain, the Russian peasant on his prairie, watching his home burn, are our neighbors, and to be aware of that, in full understanding that one's own body is hurt, is a release of the spirit with

⁹ Stanley K. Hornbeck, *The United States and the Far East*, p. 2.

¹⁰ R. A. Davies and A. J. Steiger, *Soviet Asia*, p. xii.

in the independent system, and at the same time to provide fuller educational opportunities for every child in the country regardless of birth, status and wealth. Many would have liked him to abolish the "dual system" (as the two strains of English education are called). But he has chosen to maintain diversity, believing that the life of England benefits from a mixture of educational methods provided that every child has the fullest chance of benefiting from the mixture. Here are his words:

"It is just as important to achieve diversity as it is to ensure equality of educational opportunity. But such diversity must not impair the social unity within the educational system which will open the way to a more closely knit society and give us the strength to face the task ahead. The war has revealed afresh the resources and character of the British people—an enduring possession that will survive all the material losses inevitable in the present struggle. In the youth of the nation we have our greatest national asset. Even on a basis of mere expediency, we cannot afford not to develop this asset to the greatest advantage. It is the object of the present proposals to strengthen and inspire the younger generation. For it is true today, as when it was first said, that "the bulwarks of a city are its men."

There are roughly 5,000,000 boys and girls in schools of all kinds in England and Wales between the ages of five and eighteen. Over 4,500,000 of them are in the elementary schools which, under the present system they leave at fourteen, and they are housed in 20,916 schools. The state system provides 10,363 of these schools with 3,100,000 children; the Church of England 9,000 schools with over 1,000,000 children; the Roman Catholic Church 1,260 schools with 330,000 children, and the Methodist Church 119 schools with 15,000 children.

In the field of higher education there are just over 500,000 boys and girls. The "independent schools" ("public" schools) which receive no state aid at all have only 73,000 pupils in them. They number about 400 and vary from the "great public schools" such as Eton and Winchester, to small "residential and progressive" schools maintained by special groups. The great number of "high-school" pupils are in the schools in local communities maintained by the local education authorities and inspected and approved by the Board of Education. They number 1,398 with 470,000 pupils, but 430 of these schools still keep up vestiges of independence with boards of governors operating under ancient charters, with fee-paying pupils, and a modicum of state help. Most of them are the old foundation grammar schools which have found it necessary for reasons of efficiency and equipment to come partially within the state system. They include great grammar schools like Manchester, Birmingham,

Bradford, Bristol, Leeds, Sheffield and Newcastle whose prestige has grown enormously during the last forty years as their pupils going up to the older universities of Oxford and Cambridge have challenged and largely captured those strongholds of the "public-school" and "class" tradition.

A great and far-reaching democratization of English education has gone on quietly during the last forty years, and Mr. Butler is pushing it on many steps farther. It is now easy for, say, Albert Jones, of Bristol, whose father is a railroad man earning twenty dollars a week to proceed without cost to his family to Cambridge by the scholarship system. In his elementary school at the age of ten, Albert passes an examination which takes him to Bristol Grammar School. There Albert is "good" at mathematics and as he goes up the school his masters begin to groom him for a Cambridge scholarship at eighteen. Albert is the bright and shining star of the school and he wins a \$400-a-year scholarship at Henry VIII's magnificent foundation of Trinity College, Cambridge—the home of Newton, Wordsworth, Shelley and Tennyson—to which his school and local education authority add perhaps another \$800 a year. For three years Albert mixes with the elite of Cambridge scholars growing in culture, precision of mind and speech. He wins a "double first" in the great Mathematical Tripos and is starred a Wrangler and Trinity offers him a Fellowship—the blue riband of English academic life. But Albert's mind turns more to public affairs, and he wins the highly competitive examination for the Civil Service, enters the Colonial Office, and at fifty is the governor of a vast stretch of Africa with a knighthood attached to his name, or is the expert head of a great administrative section of Whitehall.

Hundreds of able men in British public life have come the way Albert Jones came by sheer ability of brains and character. The education system has been tuned to produce them. Mr. Butler wants to do more for the seventy per cent of England's children who haven't the academic brains of Albert Jones, but who have gifts and capacities now untapped and undeveloped. He is out to find a new England amongst them—a new England of poets and dreamers, scientists and technicians, philosophers and administrators, a reborn democracy of people educated, intelligent and lively who will know how to handle books as well as machines, ideas as well as airplanes, opinions as well as an engineer's tools. Mr. Butler sees the present time as a time of ferment and upheaval in

Beyond youth, older young people and the adult, Mr. Butler is comprehensive, and he has cast about him for ideas. He has looked at the famous Folk High Schools of Denmark based on Gruntvig's belief that "whoever is to profit by learning must first have lived a while and paid heed to life in himself and in others, for so only does he get into a position to understand books that describe life." So "local authorities" in England are to set up young people's colleges where the youth of the business and industrial world can come for study and fellowship in a "socially warm" atmosphere, and where they may "learn the things they want to learn." Many of the colleges will be residential, and already some of the country residences of England are being used and many more will be. For those young people in industry who have not yet reached eighteen, attendance for at least one whole day a week in the colleges will be compulsory for forty-four weeks in the year. Mr. Butler's vision is of industry co-operating with education in seeing to it that workers are also intelligent citizens, and that a democratic industrial nation can train a people to think as well as to work. He sees the miner and shop assistant, the clerk and the railroad man, the executive and the farmer meeting and living in the colleges (which will be for adults as well as young people) and creating those lively social and cultural units which have done so much for England's democratic growth in the past. It has been often too true that only the "privileged classes" of birth and wealth have had the opportunities of leisure, travel and cultural contacts which have contributed so greatly to English life and education. That old order is passing. The new England must be a hard-working and hard-thinking country if it is to be a country of true greatness in the modern world. It can no longer rest on its achievements and, in Mr. Churchill's words, cannot carry "drones." It is in this spirit that Parliament has authorized Mr. Butler "to promote the education of the people of England and Wales" and is prepared ultimately to spend \$760,000,000 a year on the task.

Present Trend

TAYLOR E. MILLER

THE mind of the people seeks more and more to grasp the real values for whose survival we fight. This thinking does not spring only from sentimental emotionalism, which is primarily concerned with the waging of the battle, but rather strikes at the future and seems to seek a compensation for the great loss of life and material structure. Perhaps our nearness to the first stage of the World War, after which no final solution was established, is one of the main reasons for this searching. Yet, whatever the reason, it appears we now seek a postwar solution of such fundamental spiritual value, that our striving for military victory will not have been in vain.

Ralph Barton Perry notes the logic of this mood and points out the United Nations' particular responsibility in continuing to participate in the world situation after the war. "In proportion as we shall have created the situation we shall have a responsibility for its settlement. No one knows when the day will come: it may be after years of struggle; it may come suddenly and soon. It behooves us, then, to be mentally and morally prepared to meet that day, and it behooves us to commence that preparation now."¹ Perry is calling the people of the United Nations to a new consciousness of the need for actual contribution toward a harmonious world order and his call stems from a logical, practical approach to the welfare of each nation and each individual. It is a "must" for the future.

What more dreadful tragedy can torment a people than to seek for universal good and plunge into war and chaos? Dante wrote on this theme in regard to his troubled era. In his time, men were in power because of birth and not on the basis of ability. The people longed for peace, but they could do nothing about it since the government did not come from the people. In the democratic countries today, we cannot cast off the responsibility in such a way. The *people* in the United States turned away from the League of Nations in 1919. When Winston Churchill spoke in Congress, he made a particular point of the fact

¹ Ralph Barton Perry, *On All Fronts*, p. 161.

that he could be deposed by a vote at any time, and in a later speech referred to the fact that he was only acting as the servant of the House of Commons. Today, things must be done by the people themselves and they must be prepared to consider any movement that honestly seeks the establishment of a commune that will act justly as the government of all people, by all people and for all people.

The reflecting mind quickly catches the implication in the word, commune. Now we are fighting to preserve our national ethos. What will happen to it in a world order involving all people? The conditioning suggestion of Hans Kohn is most relevant here. He says: "Nationalism is not a natural Phenomenon, not a product of 'eternal' or 'natural' laws; it is a product of the growth of social and intellectual factors at a certain stage of history."²

Thus, the national ethos becomes a contributing factor to the growth of world order. It has played a most important part in the creation of a higher level of civilization, and now it is ready to offer its contribution of culture to the rest of the world. The world garden accepts every variety of flower and is enhanced by the diverse beauties of color offered by each. The process may be long and involved, but if the world view is established in the mind of the individual, the outcome is certain. "If unity of aim and purpose is maintained and if it is inspired by a devotion and earnestness equal to those which the challenge of war has evoked, these objectives can be pursued with confident hope of ultimate success."³

How then can we achieve this aim and purpose? Is any other path open except to seek the spiritual dynamic in the life of the individual and to determine how he makes this dynamic felt through his contribution to the democratic social order in which he finds himself? This dynamic is already contributing to our war effort in quite specific ways. Cordell Hull, United States Secretary of State, says: "Today, while we fight for our liberty, our free institutions and our very lives, we also fight to maintain the principality of peace, which was established on the earth nineteen centuries ago. The presentation of these priceless spiritual forces alone should inspire every person to superhuman efforts against the present world movement of barbarism and savagery."⁴ Likewise,

² Hans Kohn, *World Order in Historical Perspective*, p. 69.

³ Report of the acting Director, *The I. L. O. and Reconstruction*, p. 112.

⁴ Cordell Hull, Press Conference, Dec. 24, 1941.

it should inspire every person to superhuman efforts to create a world order after the victory that will defy any further movement of barbarism and savagery.

It is well to note the effect of this spiritual drive on persons of other localities. The Chinese development in the realm of unity and structural growth has been particularly outstanding during the last two decades. Leadership has been most essential and that leadership has rested in the hands of Sun Yat-Sen and Chiang Kai-shek primarily. Paul Linebarger says that, "each had a Western moral drive, which turned hungrily to the past and justified itself in Chinese antiquity: Sun, the all-around Christian, who professed and denied the churches alternately through life, and Chiang, the Bible-quoting Methodist, both cite the Confucian canons; both esteem the Chinese ethics; both discern the forcefulness of Western spirituality."⁵ These men have caught the vision of the faith on which we have built our civilization and they have put that vision to practical use. Now comes the challenge to the West to live up to its own faith. Kohn declares it in striking terms: "The United States and Great Britain may yet be saved, in their life-and-death struggle against the white and yellow men of Germany and Japan, by the yellow men of China and the black men of Africa, the Indians and the Negroes, the Arabs and the Malays. They will be saved by disenthraling themselves from the narrowness of their vision, by a new world view and a true catholicity, which will live up to the universal message of all civilization, of Christianity and of democracy. . . . The immense and incalculable danger of the present crisis can only be overcome in a way which justifies an immense and incalculable hope."⁶

In this striking picture we see how interdependent all groups are. If this interdependence is to be workable, it must be founded upon a philosophy of life that is appreciated by all. Alexander the Great attempted to establish such a common philosophy through the imposition of the Greek concept of life, yet this was doomed, in spite of the great influence that it had, by the very manner of its approach. The way of the conqueror will not suffice. Furthermore, the Greek emphasis was on the glory of the state. If we would present a philosophy that will be universal in its influence, we must be careful to define our role as liberator and live up to that definition. Then, if we present a philosophy,

⁵ Paul M. A. Linebarger, *The China of Chiang Kai-shek, A Political Study*, p. 258.

⁶ Hans Kohn, *World Order in Historical Perspective*, p. 269.

such as that which lies behind our own democracy, to cherish the growth of the individual, we may have reasonable assurance of success. In the Christian understanding of life the state exists to benefit all individuals and the community as a whole, as an agent, not of its own supremacy, but of the will of a God in whom there rests a moral law that will not bow to the whims of statecraft. So far from debasing the state, this activity lifts it to an infinitely higher level than does the Nazi deification of the state. For it is greater to be the instrument of the Creator of the Universe, than the despotic apex of a world of serfs. Here there is ultimate value and universal unity, for all become one in a spiritual fellowship that seeks the good of all. The democratic experiment assumed this in its infancy, and now proves it in maturity.

The theory of the state as supreme has been proven false again and again. It is this emphasis which has retarded the development of our various national cultures. Toynbee states the evil when he says that "nationality, which is nothing but a fragment of humanity, tends to set itself up as the whole."⁷ Kohn recognizes that nationality, as such, does not necessarily need to go to such extremes and ordinarily it keeps a proper balance. He says: "Generally this ultimate conclusion is not drawn, because ideas predating the age of nationalism continue to exercise their influence. These ideas form the essence of Western civilization—of Christianity as well as of enlightened rationalism: the faith in the oneness of humanity and the ultimate value of the individual. Only Fascism, the uncompromising enemy of Western civilization, has pushed nationalism to its very limit, to a totalitarian nationalism in which humanity and the individual disappear and nothing remains but the nationality, which has become the one and the whole."⁸

If we, who find ourselves in democratic societies, should allow our democratic nationalism to go to such limits, we would utterly destroy the very essence of our organization. Our own constitutional law is dependent upon trends in the social order, which in turn depend upon individual beliefs. There are power politics, it is true, but only as people are persuaded to react to movements of new purpose. We cannot make a final fascist power out of our nationalism, because we will not allow ourselves to be persuaded to such a purpose. We are a democracy or democracies, because we are citizens, who are able to make such an

⁷ Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, p. 9.

⁸ Hans Kohn, *World Order in Historical Perspective*, p. 102.

organization work. It is not only because we can read and write that we are so able, but because we are all going somewhat in the same general direction of purpose. There is a variety of opinion, but a basic understanding of purpose. The purpose is often assumed as existing where the educational motif has stressed technique, such as our training schools for government service. Yet purpose cannot exist clearly and logically without analysis and affirmation. It should be continually re-examined for education has no center without it. This basic understanding has been brought out particularly in the activity of the United States Government in dealing with other nations. Hornbeck refers to it in his statement that "the United States has but one foreign policy. That policy rests upon, resides in and flows from principles and precedents. . . . It is the product of the concepts, the thoughts, the beliefs, the aspirations, the decisions, the acts—through the years and the decades and the generations—of the American people."⁹

As we recognize that our democracies exist only as the people sustain them, we may look to other nations to examine not only their external form, but also the nature of the people. The steady trend of Russia during the past fifteen years toward a more representative expression by the government brings out an especially good case to examine. Davies and Steiger assert that in Russia "the birth of a new democracy was unmistakable. While some few lingering hostile elements are denied the privilege of equality, millions actually possess and are exercising their rights as citizens with astonishing zeal. The citizens of Soviet Asia are not a leaderless equalitarian mass. Quite the contrary. There are among them leaders directing the masses along the paths of what they call 'socialist construction.'"¹⁰

A study of the people of these different national groups only makes one realize how similar and how closely intertwined they are. To appreciate this we must continually return to our original premise of the integrity of the individual and the fundamental importance of his contribution. "There is no authority now, but the trifling voice of conscience. And what is conscience without fealty to our neighbor? The Chinaman dying in his unseen mountain, the Russian peasant on his prairie, watching his home burn, are our neighbors, and to be aware of that, in full understanding that one's own body is hurt, is a release of the spirit with

⁹ Stanley K. Hornbeck, *The United States and the Far East*, p. 2.

¹⁰ R. A. Davies and A. J. Steiger, *Soviet Asia*, p. xii.

greater power for good than is in all the systems of politics.”¹¹ But we would not break faith with our practical analysis of the situation by giving way to that sentimental emotionalism, which scientists fear so much. We would rather recognize that this expression is the outgrowth of a full realization of the complete social order with which we must deal. There can be no mere assumption of a fundamental purpose as has been the wont of those, who do not care to deal in religious belief. We must face actual existing conditions as Schwarzenberger does, when he says, “and examination of the stock of religious and moral values incorporated into the legal system of the international society offers more accurate clues as to the character of this group than mere assertions or general impressions.”¹²

Society has as its reason for existence the adjustment of diverging interests. It is synonymous with the laws that are developed to this end. But society reaches the level of community when it finds a unity of interest. Thus it is on the basis of community that international unity can be achieved. As the community of those, who believe in a harmonious world order for the good of all, spreads to engulf all of the varied societies upon the face of the earth, so shall there be created the ground for a universal society of law. But the mere creation of the structure of law without the unity of interest that a community can give will never suffice to bring harmony. An international structure of law cannot stand without a core of belief, which is shared by the majority of the participants. To achieve this is a long, hard struggle with preliminary physical conditions that will allow the free spread of ideas. The winning of the war by the United Nations is one of the most essential of these preliminary physical conditions. Yet we must never allow to lapse in the thought of all people the reason for such physical conditions; the propagation of the ideas that will make possible a universal community of interest.

Schwarzenberger further clarifies the issue: “It is hard to see how a society can be changed into a community without a fundamental change in the psychological sphere.”¹³ Thus, the patriotic feeling for the nation must be interpreted as a duty to mankind and not as a barrier against certain elements of mankind. It must become a social function in the

¹¹ H. M. Tomlinson, *The Wind Is Rising*, p. 271.

¹² George Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, p. 37.

¹³ George Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, p. 62.

functional order of all society and not a privilege for the few, who feel that it is created to support them alone. It must be made a co-operative rather than a competitive principle. This advanced and yet aged concept of the nation may become the cornerstone of a new world order based on democratic principles. It is our only adequate answer to the cynical and debasing character of the forces, which we fight.

Our struggle will have been in vain unless we recognize that we must stand firmly on the foundations of the culture, which we have already developed from the mainsprings of ancient Greece, Rome and Judea through the uniquely distinctive quality of Christianity. Christian communities, in which democracy and social justice have been made workable, hold the key to victory and postwar reconstruction in their hands. The Western organizations must be ever more conscious of their ultimate basis of existence in Christianity and be ever more willing to apply its principles to their social relationships. The more they realize and express these basic Christian principles in Western civilization, the closer they will come to interrelationship in fellowship. No theory or system can in itself displace the very foundation stones of all that our Western civilization has achieved and expect to continue that achievement. Our mistakes have been digressions and our only hope lies in an attempt to fulfill our Christian heritage.

And yet we must not rest content with foundation stones. We must build on them an adequate and practicable structure. It then becomes our business to examine and experiment with the various possibilities in world relationship on a democratic basis. Some maintain that we will need entirely new structures. Kingsley and Petegorsky affirm that "the new international organization will certainly have to repudiate the principle of national sovereignty as the basis of international law; it will have to embody both regional and universal patterns of organization."¹⁴ P. E. Corbett in his book, *Post-War Worlds*, also holds to this thesis and draws his diagram for such a program. Still it is not wisdom to tear down and rebuild until we have discovered the characteristics within the present democratic structures that have put them as far along the road as they have already gone. It would be foolish indeed to waste those structures, having already been built through long and arduous effort on the part of those, who have tried to pass our Christian heritage on to

¹⁴ J. Donald Kingsley and David W. Petegorsky, *Strategy for Democracy*, p. 57.

us. Condliffe sees this need for reaffirmation of that which we already have. He says: "The task of rebuilding international institutions on a more adequate basis must be taken up again, but the digging of foundations is more important at present than the drawing of beautiful and elaborate plans."¹⁵ We already have a corps of experienced personnel, that is dealing with workable plans based on truly scientific procedure. As Basil Mathews declares: "The technical knowledge and much of the mechanism for mastering the problem are already available for use. The will and driving force are lacking."¹⁶ The will can come only from the people in a democratic society and thus the responsibility for each and every individual is tremendous.

The professor of Constitutional Law admits that such law is built upon common principles of belief. If we start out internationally with the superstructure of formal law and not the foundations that it is built upon, we negate our action from the very beginning. To take a case in point, we may examine the beginnings of the China "incident" in 1931. The League of Nations took fair notice of the situation as soon as it arose and commissioned a committee of representatives from leading nations under the leadership of Lord Lytton of Great Britain to investigate. This committee made an unbiased report in favor of immediate and decisive action in regard to the withdrawal of Japan, and then further consideration of the case. This would have left the way open for public discussion and consideration of the problems and principles involved. Henry L. Stimson in his book, *The Far Eastern Crisis*, relates that as Secretary of State he favored the support of the Lytton report by the United States through influence even though the United States was not a member of the League. He was supported in this policy by Mr. Hoover, the President. Opposition to the report and action on it appeared in the speech of Sir John Simon, the British representative to the League. Here was a golden opportunity for the people of Great Britain and the United States to rise to open discussion and the resulting pressure on and support of their leaders. They did not do this and the League, without adequate support, could do nothing. If the people of the United States and Great Britain had supported Stimson and Lytton, respectively, through the force of public opinion, the League would have

¹⁵ J. B. Condliffe, *Agenda for a Post-War World*, p. 225.

¹⁶ Basil Mathews, "The Deeper Foundations of the New Order," *The Christian Science Monitor*, November 4, 1942.

had a great deal more to say and much more power to apply pressure. The fault for the later holocaust, then, does not rest only upon the leaders, but upon the people themselves. Until we recognize this fundamental role that every individual plays in the development of a world order we can never expect to move toward world harmony.

So delicate is the balance in world relations between force and spontaneous co-operation that neither is adequate to the fulfillment of necessary functions in our world structure, without the other. As we fight we must recognize the constant need for co-operation and when the ground for co-operation is established we must be willing to apply the proper force to make it work. This demands constant effort, and again that effort falls back upon the individual and his willingness to express himself. The only outlet to the dilemma is that of Christian education. We must develop a scheme of world education on the structure of the existing instruments for its realization. To do this will require the backbone of sustained force throughout the years ahead, but a force that does not get out of balance with spontaneous co-operation. Democracies will destroy themselves with their own force, if they do not continually keep this in the forefront of their thinking. Many technical and purely human factors must be faced in an attempt to establish a community of those ruled by the Christian principle, which has leavened our Western culture. But with a firm foundation in our Christian heritage and with the development of a progressively integrated society through Christian education on a world-wide basis of equal expression for all, there is every hope in the future. We must continue on to examine the workable procedures for each area of the earth and never fail to seek, through the eyes of scientific endeavor, new techniques. Yet, in the words of Thomas Wolfe, the wind is rising and the rivers flow. A new day is dawning for human relationships. If our minds are established on the rock of real Christian enlightenment, we cannot fail to search the farthest reaches of the human personality through the free interplay provided by community. The condition of world order for all peoples must now give individuals release from the doom of drifting into inevitable cross purposes through provincial or empirical nationalism.

What a tragedy it has been, that we have failed to see this in the past. But how monstrous the tragedy will be, if we lose sight of it again in the future.

The Propaganda Problem of the Church

LOCKHART AMERMAN

IF ONE symptom is more apparent than any other in current discussions of religious education, it is the abominable ease with which interested persons can misunderstand each other. The semantics of the business is well-nigh chaotic. My definition of teaching may be your definition of cruelty to children. It will be well, therefore, to say at the outset that what I understand by the problem of religious education is *the problem of Christian propaganda*. The final word is used quite deliberately; for despite its present political associations, it is essentially a term ecclesiastical, reminiscent of our early Christian ancestors and their insistence on the seed that must be sown. In the paragraphs that follow, then, it will be our purpose to discover, first, certain basic errors which preclude the establishment of a satisfactory educational scheme; second, certain problems that confront the propagandist even after his initial misconceptions are removed; and third, some kind of constructive suggestion as to the conduct of our future teaching.

I

The worst error into which either a chess player or a field marshal can fall is to foresee a victory where none exists. Similarly, the fatal error of the propagandist is to assume that the objects of his persuasion are already pretty well persuaded. Conversely, the wise advocate assumes the worst until the best is won. Mr. Wrigley has good reason to believe that a vast majority of Americans are addicted to his spearmint confection; but he advertises as if no one had ever heard of it.

I am referring in the above paragraph to *the comfortable assurance which most of us have that America—despite appearances to the contrary—is admittedly a Christian nation*. Here again, of course, the question of definition arises: but if, by calling these United States a Christian land we mean that a substantial majority of its inhabitants know what Christianity is, and in consequence cherish Christian principles and Christian objectives, we surely deceive ourselves.

The institutional test with its statistical evidence is, perhaps, a poor index. Actual practice as to enrollment varies: it is the custom of the Roman Church to include all baptized infants; most Protestant bodies record only confirmed communicants. Even at the best, evidence of formal af-

filiation is a questionable proof of active interest in Christianity. With every allowance, however, for the doubtful value of statistics, it is well to realize that on the basis of the 1936 census, less than 40 per cent of the American population claims any definite Christian affiliation whatsoever.¹ Nearly two thirds of the country, in other words, is so completely outside the Christian community as not even to have achieved or maintained communicant status.

Perhaps the situation would be less arresting, if we were able to assume that all of the 40 per cent enrolled possessed a conscious and informed Christianity. Unfortunately, no such assumption is tenable. The average minister in the average congregation knows perfectly well that there is a portion of his flock who have no idea what they are doing when they come to church. And if, through some catastrophe, it became necessary to measure Christian allegiance in terms of third-century sacrifice—one hesitates to ponder the results. Perhaps the challenge of danger would help rather than hinder lay interest. The fact remains, however, that under present circumstances, a dangerously large proportion of nominal Christians are content to remain nominal and nothing more. A symptom of their attitude is the increasing tendency within the Protestant churches toward a kind of *high clericalism*.

At the time of the Reformation, much was said of the evils of priestcraft. Christianity was to be given back to the people. No earthly mediator was needed; no intermediary was permissible; and to the end that a generation conditioned to error might be instructed in the truth, Calvin, for one, set over his people a new order of teaching ministers, whose task it was to make plain the rediscovered accessibility of God.

So much for the dream of the reformers. The tendency of our own day is to reverse the process, and depend for the life of the Church not on the will and wit of the people, but on the wisdom and works of the minister. Indeed, the process is something like acquiring a specimen Christian, a kind of token saint to represent the rest—a professional, if you will, who “really knows” about such matters. And in the so-called nonliturgical churches, every item of worship from pastoral prayer to featured sermon, points up this professionalism: the worshiper attends, apparently to hear someone else say, and see someone else do, what he ought to be saying and doing himself.

¹ These statistics are derived from C. H. Mochlman, *School and Church: The American Way*, Harper & Brothers, 1944, p. 123.

Thus within the national minority of nominal Christians, a parochial minority of professionals is created. It grows increasingly absurd to talk about "our great Christian country of America." It grows more and more inappropriate to think in terms of education—with all the term implies of interested and responsive students. It becomes more and more necessary to aim at propaganda—the suasion and conviction of those who are at best indifferent and at worst antagonistic.

The point may be raised that it is unfair to equate Christianity with institutionalism—to exclude from the Church those pure souls for whom the Church's corruption and cowardice is intolerable. I may, in fact, be accused of forgetting the Church Invisible. With all respect, I have done nothing of the sort. I yield to no man in my regard for the Church Invisible; but regrettably, since it *is* invisible, I can't see it (and neither can anyone else), and I am therefore compelled to examine the Church I *can* see, and base my conclusions on that. Nor do I deem that out of regard for the Church Invisible, institutional Christianity must be pushed aside as a religious irrelevancy. We have our treasure in earthen vessels: to repudiate the vessels will not necessarily improve the treasures.

Yet the second basic error under which vast numbers labor is *the notion that ecclesiastical or organized Christianity is an extracurricular activity in the school of life*. Most people advocate some sort of philosophy for living. Most schools are spectacularly interested in "character-building." When, however, the need for religion is broached, most people cheerfully relegate it to the realm of one-hour electives. I am using academic jargon; but the thing goes far deeper than our actual practice in education. The very name *Sunday* school implies at most a sabbatical importance. The usual forty-five-minute-once-a-week session represents precisely $1/224$ of the week's time; it is symbolic of infinitesimal emphasis. The total absence of religious teaching in the average day school says to the pupil in an offhand way: "Oh, *that* stuff! Well, if your old man insists, you may get some of it on Sundays—but not here! We're not interested in that. We're only interested in what is really important!"

As time wears on and fewer and fewer parents remember any other academic attitude, it is small wonder that we cannot turn to adult Christianity for a sounder view of Christian discipline. The papers and the pundits tell us we must "reach the parents"—with the idea, apparently, that a parent is a kind of faucet, requiring merely to be turned on. Unfortunately, there are many faucets disconnected from the reservoir: and

turn we never so madly, they will still be dry. It doesn't do any good to swear at them; indeed, there is small reason in the Church's thundering denunciation of an unco-operative parenthood: it was the Church, in large measure, that disconnected the original piping.

And today, Christianity itself is in peril of adopting the very weakness which it has permitted in its children. Strange as it may sound or seem, the Church is in danger of holding too poor an opinion of itself—of passively accepting the proffered second fiddle. For Christianity, to many Americans, is simply a rather elaborate expression of the universal human ethic. Its supernatural irrelevancies, we are told, must, in the course of time, slough off. Its symbolic anachronisms cannot be permitted to retard development. Some day, one suspects, the mind of God will reach an equal maturity with the mind of man. After all:

America's democracy comprehends the value in Christianity. The older forms, expressions, and postulates of religion are rapidly vanishing among our intellectuals. Traditional Christianity is disintegrating so far as its institutional manifestations are concerned. But the Christianity that can never die, that has functional value, is interwoven with all our democratic activities.

So writes Prof. C. H. Moehlman, of Colgate-Rochester Divinity School,² in a passage strangely reminiscent of Alfred Rosenberg. If "national socialism" be substituted for "democracy" in the sentences quoted, the whole paragraph reads like a Nazi textbook. Yet Doctor Moehlman, curiously enough, appends the foregoing to a just and scathing criticism of Adolf Hitler.

To my mind, the third basic misconception to be destroyed is precisely this equation of Christianity with ethics whether the ethics be national or personal. Until Doctor Moehlman's interesting little book appeared, I had been under the impression that Protestant theologians were increasingly agreed upon this point. The vast majority of them, certainly, have attached a measure of importance to such "older postulates" as the Incarnation of our Lord and the sinful state of man. Yet when Doctor Moehlman wants a horrible example of divisive bigotry, he quotes (in startled italics) the following assertion of Pious XI:

Every method of education founded wholly or in part on the denial or forgetfulness of original sin and grace, and relying on the powers of human nature is unsound.³

² *Op. cit.*, p. 125.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

Alas, it is to be feared that Pope Pius writes merely as a Christian, while Doctor Moehlman, of course, is an educator.

Even if theologians, however, are pretty well united in a re-emphasis of Christian belief as the source of Christian behavior, such unity represents only the "professional" group to which I have already referred. The nonprofessionals are several years behind their hired men in all such basic concepts; and your really up-to-date congregation at this writing, freed at last from the shackles of bibliolatry, is apt to feel pretty pleased with itself for having discovered the social gospel. Before its members can be expected to unite in a program of re-education, they will have to be thoroughly persuaded that you can't solve the problem of original sin—or even provide a road to world redemption—by "teaching little boys to play basketball."

II

As propagandists, then, we are first of all aware of our minority status. We are convinced that our message is of high and final importance. And we have come to realize that an educated Christian possesses something more than Christian manners and morals. Having achieved these basic realizations, we are ready to face the contemporary problems of which our American Christianity is only too sadly aware.

What must we teach? As Christians, we look to the Church for an answer. As Protestants, we find 265 churches, each with an answer of its own. Or so it seems at first glance. A veritable Babel of voices rises in contradictory insistence. "Motor phenomena are the signs of true conversion." "Immersion is the one acceptable mode of baptism." "Church government is a matter for individual congregations to decide." "Christianity is ritual." "Ritual has no place in Christian worship." So it goes. The demon Adiaphora chuckles in his smoky beard, and the proverbial visitor from Mars cannot find the Church for the churches.

Does it follow that denominations must vanish before Christian education can be successful? By no means. I have no wish—in the words of Father Ronald Knox—to see "the milk of human kindness stirred to butter in a lordly dish." But it follows that something must be done to emphasize the Christian core of common belief, something that will relegate to second-place marginal divergence and denominational idiosyncrasy. The teaching-approach must be primarily Christian, magnifying the Church, though it be at the expense of the churches.

In the *Manual of Prayers* recommended for the use of the Roman Catholic laity, there is on p. 25 the title "What a Christian Must Believe." There ensues a catena of classical Roman doctrine. It is the sort of take-it-or-leave-it pronouncement that makes most Protestants grind their teeth. But it has this virtue: after a good Romanist has read it, he knows what he is *supposed* to think. He may turn from it unconvinced, but hardly uninformed. A single authoritative voice has spoken. Whereas the Protestant Christian as such is left in these days to wonder just what his affiliation implies; nor is he helped one whit by tables of so-called Protestant statistics which generously include the Unitarians, the Christian Scientists, and—for all I know—the adherents of Unity-I-Am. Somehow or other we must inform our lay people that their responsibility includes rather more than a distaste for the College of Cardinals.

Yet who is there to say what comprises the classical philosophy of Protestantism? What the evangelical churches hold in common is surely of greater moment than what divides them. Most of them, indeed, will grant as much. They will even unite in positive pronouncements of an ethical sort. But when they reach back further—to the intellectual and emotional commitments from which ethical views arise—they are seized with a trembling lest any worthy soul or system be excluded by the terms of their assertion. What irony it is to make of theological silence a basis for ecclesiastical harmony! It is not a Least Common Denominator that we need, but a Highest Common Factor. Which is another way of saying that Protestantism has forgotten its catholicity.

And since Christianity is in essence the proclamation and acceptance of an historic fact—the historic fact that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself"—it behooves us to know and to teach the importance which that fact has had for men of every generation. For truth to tell, the structure of our present secular culture leaves the most cordial enquirer quite in the dark as to why Christianity matters at all. The average attendant at Sunday school simply doesn't know *why* he must study what is taught him. From the very air he breathes he is daily persuaded of the gross irrelevancy of religion. The more intelligent he is, the more unreasonable he will find the processes of Christian education, unless—here I anticipate our closing consideration of suggested remedies—unless the curriculum offered in the church school validates theology by an historical approach. (I am using the word "historical" in its broadest sense.) For it is only as the pupil sees that the ideas and ideals of classical

DARTMOUTH
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

Christianity have had tremendous power in the past that he will begin to grasp their importance for the present. And it is only as he understands the essential sameness of the human problem that he will realize the timeless applicability of the Christian answer. The American Way—an anomalous term, I admit—has been dignified, celebrated and made into vivid reality for thousands of school children by the teaching of American history. It remains for a new emphasis on the history of the Church—the storehouse of Christian experience—to validate the way of the gospel in belief as in behavior.

Yet the problem of the propagandist is *not simply what to teach but how*. For he lives in a world devoted educationally to techniques. His secular colleagues have reached the point where credits in pedagogy, rather than knowledge of anything, qualify them as good teachers. Yet the victims of the system are not wholly to be blamed. They are merely the final sorry products of an educational decadence which began when President Eliot decided to temper the winds of Harvard to the shorn lambs of the frontier. How ran the formula? Every American is constitutionally entitled to as much education as he wants. Not every American is mentally equipped for as much education as he would like. Very well—change your educational requirements, and the problem will be solved.

It seems a simple and almost a sensible business; but behind it there lurks the reality of a dreadful transformation. Education was to be no more an end in itself, but a means of getting something else. And with their eye upon that something else—a rise most probably in station or in salary—thousands upon thousands of young Americans have entered the academic mills, patiently accumulated “hours” and emerged with what they felt was a lifetime ticket to the section reserved for white collars.

What I say here has all been said before, but I wonder whether its influence on specifically religious education has been realized. For religious education—Christian propaganda—has nothing but itself to offer. It cannot guarantee anything beyond itself. It promises mere knowledge—mere understanding of life—mere ability to grasp the good and true and beautiful. No wonder the prospective pupil is dismayed, and no wonder he feels that the Christian curriculum is scarcely worth his while. He may even in time catch some notion of the true significance of Christ, but it will hardly raise his pay. Whereas the acquisition of secular learning is—well, practical.

Add to the force of this comparison, if you will, the tendency among

our pedagogues to sneer at revealed religion as something from which our generation has been mercifully liberated. Impermeable to the best in present-day philosophy, they cling to the romantic dogma of inevitable human progress, and mark every step of this advance with the tombstone of a superstition. By way of climax—if they think of the Church at all—they have the astonishing effrontery to suppose that the Church pretty well agrees with them! (To this description I know that there are individual exceptions: I am giving my impression of the average secular influence.) Is it anything to marvel at if our young people—and our adults as well—look towards the Church's program of education as a quaint survival? One word more of the matter of techniques before we turn to positive suggestion. Be it known that we shall not finally solve our propaganda problem by methodology. It simply doesn't matter whether a man knows *how* to teach Christianity or not, if he doesn't know what Christianity *is*.

III

It is finally our concern to offer certain concrete suggestions for the future. One must admit at once that most of the propaganda channels available are already in use by the Church, for we know how the average American receives most of his impressions. There is the printed word, the radio, the motion-picture theater and the school, the last of these applying exclusively to children and young people, the others of universal reference.

The one who said "Comparisons are odious," was right; but there is something to be said for a comparative study of the use made of the press, radio and screen by Protestant and Roman Christianity. Among numerous popular articles published during the past few years and dealing with the chaplaincy, a decided majority gave special prominence to the work of the Romanist padres. In the opinion of many listeners united Protestantism offers no radio program half so effective as the "Catholic Hour." Out of seven films produced during recent months and publicized as "Hollywood's recognition of religion," exactly seven advocated in some way or other the faith and practice of the Roman Catholic Church. The comparison is not offered in criticism of Rome, but as an index of Protestant slackness and inefficiency. Unless we say that the Romanist has more to offer than we, we must admit that something is decidedly wrong with our public relations. And public relations is simply propaganda writ large. Indeed, to move against today's secular convictions with our present min-

imum use of today's effective media is like tackling a wheatfield with a pair of scissors.

But one fine morning the Church will wake up. Christian films, Christian broadcasts and Christian periodicals will be placed on a new footing, afforded a new emphasis and given a new measure of support. And then—who knows?—perhaps the very parent who for years has sympathized with Junior's positive distaste for Sunday school will be able to say with the conviction of absolute sincerity, "Junior, this religion-business is the most important thing in the world."

One wonders, as a matter of fact, whether Sunday school will satisfy this future parent in his plans for Junior. To be sure, the once-a-week session can be improved; and perhaps the ultimate solution lies in a reform in the content of its curriculum. Yet it is the growing conviction of many that the average Sunday school demands not so much a reformation as a revolution. Under present practice it proposes to comprise within a single hour the week's stint not alone of Christian teaching, but of corporate Christian worship. Thirty-six hours a week are not too much for the juvenile brain, says your educator; one hour a week is ample for the growing soul. The very terms of the division betray a false premise. For the soulless brain is surely something out of H. G. Wells—and far less distinguished authors have dealt with brainless religion.

Yet the idea is curiously prevalent that Christianity is a matter of emotion and not of understanding. Granted that it ultimately consists in personal allegiance to Christ, are we not adding to the number of religious illiterates within the Church by the low standard of our requirement for membership? Six weeks in a communicants' class? Shades of the ancient catechumenate!

Two further possibilities emerge. The first of these is an expansion of the Christian teaching program by the use of weekday time. A typical arrangement would be the release of the last school period, let us say, on Thursdays. The children who elected the course (religion cannot be required) would divide into groups and report for instruction to their denominational headquarters (very few communities will tolerate religious instruction on school property—in Pennsylvania, for instance, it is forbidden by law). In some places a threefold division into Protestant, Romanist and Jewish groups has proved sufficient.

The difficulties of this scheme are apparent. It is a step in the right direction; but a step that only applies to those who are willing to take it. It relies, in fact, on the Christian-America myth according to the terms

of which Christian parents will snatch eagerly at every opportunity for the religious training of their children. Far from snatching eagerly, however, a good many parents have shown complete indifference. Besides, the secular mind is confused by this innovation. Freedom of religion has for so long been taken to mean freedom *from* religion that authority is troubled for the outcome of this new departure. School boards view it nervously; village Ingersolls behold in it the horrid once-laid ghost of institutionalized superstition; Protestants shudder at the thought of Roman collars in a tax-supported schoolroom; Romanists wonder at the advisability of unregulated religious speculation.

The Romanists, however—and the Missouri Synod Lutherans, and a number of other groups—have their own answer to the problem. That answer is the church-controlled or parochial school.

"It was tried once, but it didn't work." So say many. And it is true enough that with a few exceptions, the Protestant churches which once fostered numerous academies have now relinquished the educational task to secular agencies. Dr. Lewis Sherrill has shown us that the Presbyterians, for example, maintained between 1846 and 1870, over 260 parochial institutions.⁴ Yet by 1870, nearly all these had vanished. Which convinces some of our experts that parochial education and Protestantism will not mix. Yet plain facts defy them—the plain fact, for example, that from 1941 to 1943, while the Presbyterian Church (U. S. A.), devoid of parochial schools, recorded a gain in accessions of three quarters of one per cent, the Missouri Synod Lutherans with over 2,700 schools and 3,000 teachers could boast a nineteen-per-cent increase, or more than twenty-five times the Presbyterian gain.⁵ It is a fact, too, that during the same period, the Pentecostal sect, with a minimum of educational program, recorded the astonishing rise of more than ninety per cent. Yet this figure, taken in conjunction with the Lutheran report, seems merely to offer the Church a choice between the complete abandonment of intellectual approach and the serious presentation of Christian information. In a day of religious illiteracy, the official endorsement of ignorance will naturally attract a following. But the success of the Lutheran experiment puts to shame the more tentative programs of larger Protestant groups whose assets, financial and otherwise, should fully equip them for an intelligent and aggressive policy of instruction.

As for the mid-nineteenth century Presbyterian attempt, its failure was

⁴ Sherrill, Lewis Joseph: *Presbyterian Parochial Schools, 1846-1870*, Yale University Press, 1932, p. 49.

⁵ Figures based on the *Year Book for American Churches*, 1941, 1943.

latent in its timing. It was inaugurated in the face of a growing national confidence in secular education, and in a decade when the opportunities of the frontier made it impossible to secure or retain competent teachers in settled areas. It was launched in the dubious wake of revivalism, battered by four years of war between the states, and done to death by the unwillingness of Presbyterians to set apart a trained teaching order.

It will be said, perhaps, that modern parochial education will find no backing, that the same considerations which restrict enrollment in religious electives will weigh even more heavily against ecclesiastical education. It will be pointed out that Romanist parochial schools serve less than half the children of American Romanist families. But if anything like fifty per cent of Protestant children had a church-directed education, the next generation of Protestant adults might show something like the loyalty to their Church that is typical of Roman Catholics. As for the possible failure of Protestant families to take advantage of a parochial program, it seems to me that such a failure would be less and less likely as the parochial program showed itself more and more independent of today's secular philosophy of education.

If our age were one of optimism; if the romantic dogmas of progress and self-salvation were still tenable; if popular education had proved itself worthy of intelligent respect—then, indeed, there would be little prospect for successful intervention by the Church in educational affairs. But today thinking men and women are increasingly skeptical of secular ideals. (Even in the midst of an idealistic war it is generally admitted that the Atlantic Charter died a-borning.) It is apparent, too, that no self-levitation by the bootstrap route is really feasible. A growing desire for standards, and a growing wish that education be once more not a means but an end in itself—these are daily more apparent to everyone in America, except the professionals in secular education. Whether the Church advances a complete new program or merely begins in a small way to take up the long-slack reins of its propaganda mission; whether the ultimate answer lies in radio broadcasts, released hours or parochial schools, it is high time that organized Christianity declared itself uniquely the servant of God, enunciating a policy of its own without regard to popular prejudice, and shouldering once more the burden of a militant minority. For by militant minorities, the world is changed.

Treasure in Earthen Vessels

MILLAR BURROWS

CONTRASTING the eternal power of the gospel and the mortal weakness of its ministers, the apostle Paul wrote, "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels" (II Corinthians 4:7). The figure is a vivid one to a student of archaeology. Earthen vessels are his stock in trade, and now and then, like the man in the parable, he finds a hoard of coins or jewelry, deposited many centuries ago in a pottery jar and hidden in a field. One may take treasure in earthen vessels as a symbol of the Bible itself, especially as archaeology now enables us to understand it.

Near Eastern archaeology in general and biblical archaeology in particular enjoyed a protracted field day during the decades between World Wars I and II, but since the outbreak of the present war (God grant it may soon be past!) the lands of the Bible have been of such strategic importance for the military forces of the United Nations, and so inaccessible to civilians, that peaceful pursuits like archaeology have been largely interrupted. A few interesting discoveries have been made, for the most part incidentally and accidentally, as in the course of repairing streets and sewers; but the only major exception to the general rule of suspended animation has been Nelson Glueck's archaeological survey of Transjordan.

So far as the archaeologists have had time free from special wartime activities, the interruption of their work in the field has enabled them to study and publish the accumulated results of their previous excavation and exploration, some of which have been awaiting publication for as much as twenty years. Opportunity is afforded also to ponder the net results of the work in the large, and the wider questions raised by it. What has it all amounted to? Does it give us any help in the present situation, or in planning for the future?

The condition of humanity at present gives the remains of dead civilizations a terrible relevance. If man has survived the catastrophes to which every excavation bears eloquent witness, he can also endure the sufferings of this present time. Common people the world over are proving this already. But what comfort is it that the race can survive? One cannot ponder the recurring evidence that proud civilizations have perished, one after another, and still face with any complacency the horror and chaos of our time. What the death of a civilization means can be realized

only when one has seen wretched people existing in squalor and ignorance amid the ruins of ancient glory. The archaeologist can hardly help wondering whether he may have to say some day in bitter earnest:

"Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre."

Unfortunately his research can give him only an occasional hint as to what caused these ancient civilizations to perish. It can tell him little if anything as to what can be done to prevent the death of our own civilization. He may even be led to ask himself whether civilization is after all the supreme goal of human endeavor, and what are really the most enduring values of man's life on earth. Seeing that cruelty and greed and weakness can bring suffering to innocent millions and blot out for centuries even the lights of the spirit, he may be tempted to conclude with Ecclesiastes that there is nothing new under the sun, and that there is nothing better for man than to live virtuously but quietly, without ambition or inordinate desire, avoiding trouble as much and as long as he can. But such conclusions may be reached without engaging in archaeological research. Archaeology itself cannot solve the riddles of the meaning of life and its true ends.

For the answer to such questions the Christian turns to his Bible. Whatever help archaeology can give him in these matters it gives by helping him to understand the Bible better. This it does abundantly, but not by any blinding flash of light such as came to Paul on the road to Damascus, making everything clear at once and bringing order out of chaos. Archaeology cannot even teach by line upon line and precept upon precept: like research in any other field of knowledge, it can only fit together facts and fragments of facts, as the sherds of a shattered earthen vessel are painfully pierced together to recover its form and decoration.

One major conclusion, however, is brought home more and more by archaeology and the related disciplines, and that is the fact that the life of Israel and the early Church was an integral part of the life of western Asia. Hebrew culture was not something *sui generis*; it was part and parcel of the international culture of the times. This is true in every period. It is as true of later Judaism and the early Church as it is of Israel in the time of Solomon or Ahab. In such mythological conceptions as we find in the texts from Nippur or Nineveh or Ugarit, in such laws as we find in the Code of Hammurabi and the Assyrian and Hittite Codes, in the social and economic institutions reflected in innumerable letters and

contracts and court records, over and over again we are impressed with the organic unity of culture throughout the world of the Bible, and the fact that the Bible at each stage of its growth fits into this setting and is obviously at home in it. Even in religion there are contacts and parallels.

All this makes the Bible immeasurably more vivid and real, removing all possible suspicion of artificiality or later invention. By enabling us to understand much better the people to whom the prophets and apostles spoke and for whom the authors wrote, it helps us to determine with greater accuracy and certainty just what the inspired speakers and writers wished to convey. We are thus in a much better position than before to avoid false interpretations and wrong applications for our own lives.

But if the Bible is just one expression of the general culture of western Asia, and especially if Hebrew and early Christian religion are only one branch of a larger tree in which all the birds of the ancient world had their nests, the unique significance of the Bible as the Word of God seems seriously compromised. It becomes harder to say just what we mean by revelation and inspiration if we acknowledge that a snatch of Canaanite verse is quoted here and a bit of Egyptian wisdom literature there, or that some of the laws supposed to have been delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai had been promulgated centuries earlier by Hammurabi at Babylon. Must we hold the Spirit guilty of plagiarism, or restrict its influence to the suggestion of bibliographical references? Archaeology, of course, is not by itself in raising these questions. Efforts to adjust theology to modern science and philosophy had long since produced concessions and a general weakening of the sense of a divine communication in the Scriptures. The events of our time are driving men back upon the Word, but all too often with a confused or obscurantist notion of its real significance. Perhaps it may be reckoned as a real contribution of archaeology that it compels us to raise anew the question of originality and hence of inspiration in the Bible. Without pretending to contribute anything new, I should like to state briefly, as I see it, the meaning of revelation, inspiration and authority in the Bible, and then come back to the relation between these Christian convictions and the findings of archaeology.

It should go without saying that the Bible, as a whole and in its various parts, is not intended to satisfy curiosity or teach the secrets of controlling nature, but to tell what man must know and do to be saved, with all the changing meanings of that term. The Old Testament deals throughout with the judgment of God and what Israel must do to avoid

it and obtain the divine blessing. In the New Testament this has become a question of what the individual must do to inherit eternal life. Throughout the Bible, in one form or another, the two great subjects of revelation are what God proposes to do and what man must do.

Sometimes, to be sure, what God reveals is not truth but Himself. Much more often and more directly, however, it is not His nature but His purpose or will for men that is revealed. When He appears or reveals Himself, it is usually to command, warn or promise. What the person or group to whom He speaks is to do and what will be the consequences of obedience or disobedience are the usual content of revelation. History and poetry elaborate, illustrate and enforce these central themes of law, prophecy and the gospel.

Strictly speaking, the Bible is not one revelation but a record of many revelations, dim and partial at first but growing more clear and complete until they reach their climax and fulfillment in Christ, the Word made flesh. The fact that there is continuity and underlying unity in them all justifies us in speaking of the Bible as the Word of God, a comprehensive divine disclosure of all that man needs to know for his salvation.

The revelations recorded in the Bible consisted of religious insights, received by individuals through experiences of many kinds and recorded by them in various literary forms. Not the words but the men were inspired, not the literary record but the experiences recorded by it. The inspiration of the Bible is the divine influence, however conveyed and received, by which the spiritual insights recorded in its pages were given to men. Much confusion has been caused by thinking of inspiration in terms of the method by which God made Himself and His will known, and by conceiving this method crudely, as though God had dictated the very words in which the Bible was written.

In practice, if not in theory, even the exact wording of the King James Version is often treated as inerrant. No thoughtful and informed person, however, can claim that any translation is infallible. A comparison of the Authorized Version and the Revised Version, for example, soon shows that at many points one or the other, if not both, is wrong. But most readers must always be dependent upon a translation.

Some of the differences between translations are due to the fact that they follow different manuscripts. The text itself has come down to us in different forms which vary considerably, even to the addition or omission of whole sentences and paragraphs. An example which comes

to mind immediately is the fact that I John 5:7, as found in the Authorized Version, is omitted by the Revised Version without even a marginal note to call attention to it, because it is not found in the best manuscripts. No one manuscript can be accepted as an infallible reproduction of what was originally written.

All but the most ignorant and superficial readers of the Bible, of course, recognize these facts. Many, however, maintain that while errors have been made in the transmission of the manuscripts and in translation, the original "autographs" of the books of the Bible were verbally inspired and free from error in every detail. Whether that was so or not is a purely academic question. We do not have the original autographs. If the value of the Bible as the Word of God for us depends on its being free from all error of any kind, our case is hopeless. If there ever was such a Bible, it has long been lost. What we as Christians believe is not that a long-lost Bible was God's Word. We believe that the Bible as we have it is the Word of God, in spite of all errors of transmission and translation. The original text is lost, but the gospel is not lost. Through all the differences of translations and manuscripts it shines forth clearly.

Since the value of the Bible as a revelation of God and His will is not dependent on verbal accuracy, it is not necessary to suppose even that every statement in the original autographs was correct. Such an assumption would be necessary only if we supposed that the very words were dictated by the Holy Spirit. But, to put the matter in very childish terms, if God had dictated the Bible word for word, and had regarded complete accuracy as important, He would surely have provided also for infallible transmission and translation, or at least for the preservation of the original manuscripts, in order that later copies and versions might be corrected by comparison with them.

As a matter of fact, if the religious value of the Bible stood or fell with its complete accuracy as regards historical or scientific facts, we should not have to consult archaeology to determine whether or not it possessed such inerrancy. Within the Bible itself there are well-known instances of discrepancy between one statement and another, such as the two genealogies of Jesus or the two accounts of the death of Judas Iscariot. In such a case, both statements cannot be correct, yet if one of them is wrong, the Bible is not completely accurate in such matters. No amount of demonstration that this or that statement is true can remove these difficulties. But they are difficulties only for history, not for religion.

The reluctance of believers to admit that there can be factual errors in the Bible is easily understood. If we must choose between truth and error in the Bible, accepting some things and rejecting others, it must be assumed that we are able to tell whether a statement is true or false by some other criterion than the fact of its presence in the Bible. Quoting Scripture in that case no longer proves anything. But what then becomes of the authority of the Bible, which is the cornerstone of Protestant faith?

There are two ways of considering the authority of the Bible. One is to start with the conviction that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, and that everything in it must therefore be true, and from this to conclude that we must accept every statement in the Bible whether or not it seems true to us. The other way is to find out first what the Bible says, and then, if this commends itself to our own best reason and judgment, to conclude that the Bible is a true revelation. At first sight the former way of looking at the matter may seem to honor the Bible more, putting its authority above man's weak and fallible judgment. In practice, however, it is difficult, if not impossible, to carry this point of view through consistently. To start with the assumption that everything in the Bible is true, and then without fear or prejudice inquire what the Bible says, committing ourselves in advance to accept this, however contrary it may prove to be to all our previous ideas or the testimony of our experience and reason, is something that few if any could actually do. Many doubtless think that they accept the authority of the Bible in this sense, but unconsciously they force the statements of the Bible into the mold of what they already believe. They bring their own ideas with them and read these into the Bible, making the Scriptures conform to their beliefs instead of conforming their beliefs to the Scriptures. More or less consciously they follow some such line of reasoning as this: "The Bible is true; this idea is true; therefore this must be what the Bible teaches, and it must be so interpreted regardless of any appearance to the contrary." There are those, for example, who, believing that the earth is a sphere, feel compelled to interpret the Bible as teaching this view, though honest exegesis leaves no room for doubt that all the writers believed quite otherwise. Others find it necessary to convince themselves that while the Bible plainly says the world was created in six days, it means a long period of hundreds and thousands of years.

When we come to the Bible with an open mind and ask what it actually says and means, if we then find that what it says is in accord

with our own best knowledge and judgment, we can say that we accept the Bible because we find in it what we cannot help believing to be true. This attitude requires more real respect for the Scriptures than one which allows us to interpret them according to our own ideas. It requires freedom as against the authority of Church or tradition, but it requires submission to the authority of facts and sound reasoning. It allows us to say, "I do not believe this, even though the Bible teaches it." It does not allow us to say, "I do not believe this, therefore the Bible does not teach it."

From this point of view there is no difficulty in recognizing the existence of errors in the Bible. We are not bound to accept or reject the Bible *in toto*. Leaving aside without regret anything which seems to belong to outmoded ways of thinking, we may still find, and do find, so much that commands our assent as true, our consent as worthy and right, that we say, "This is the Book of books, in which I find as nowhere else the deepest and fullest truth and most challenging ideals of life."

If we feel free to pick and choose what we shall believe and what we shall reject, do we not transfer the seat of authority from the Word of God to our own minds? That way of putting the question is misleading, for we are not at all free to accept what we like and reject what we do not like. We must follow our reason and conscience, the voice of God in our own minds and hearts, and there indeed is the real seat of authority for us. When the Spirit within us cries "Amen," we have no choice. When our minds say, "Yes, that is true," and our consciences say, "That is right," we are bound to accept what they endorse. When they say, "That is false" or "That is wrong," we are bound to reject it. If then we find in the Bible ideas which we cannot honestly accept, yet which we cannot honestly read out of the Bible or transform into something else, can we still speak of the Bible as the Word of God? We can if the Bible actually speaks to us as God's voice, if it says something to us which our minds, hearts and consciences recognize as right and true. Then, and only then, is there any real revelation in the Bible for us. Then, and only then, has it any authority over us.

But does this not put the Bible on a level with other books? Is not the same thing true of any source of ideas or ideals? May we not hear the voice of truth and right, compelling our assent, in any book, or through the voices of living men? May not any great literature which so stirs and moves, convinces and persuades, be called the Word of God?

Most assuredly it may. Wherever truth or duty speaks to us, it is the voice of God that speaks. Whenever we are inspired to better living, it is God who inspires us. There is no truth or beauty or goodness that does not come from Him. God may speak through books or living persons, through nature or art or music; He may speak through the church, the school, the home or any other channel by which knowledge, appreciation or moral vision may come to us. If there are people who cannot hear His voice in the Bible but can hear it in some of these other ways, we can only rejoice that they hear His voice at all. We cannot say it is not God's voice that they hear because they do not hear it as we do. If it is good and true, it is God-given, it is inspired, it is revelation and it has authority. When any truth comes home to us, we may say, and perhaps more truly than we realize, "That is a revelation to me."

But there are great differences between the various channels or vehicles of revelation. There is more truth, more vision, more inspiration in some than in others. There are differences not only of degree but of kind, differences in the sort of thing with which the revelation is concerned. It is good to be given insight into the physical constitution of the universe, into history as a body of facts, or into the nature of social institutions. It is much more important, much more vital and imperative, that we be given insight into the basic values of human life, the meaning of existence, our place in the universal scheme of things. It is good to know the world and man; it is better to know God. It is good to know how we must conduct ourselves in order to secure bodily health and safety; it is immeasurably more important that we know what we must do to inherit eternal life. In both degree and kind there are vast differences between the varied agencies of revelation.

Now when we ask ourselves, our neighbors and mankind at large where actually the most and the highest insight has been found, the answer is that God has not left Himself without witness among any people, but within those branches of the human family that have become acquainted with the Hebrew-Christian cultural and spiritual tradition, far and away the greatest, most complete revelation of God and of the way to life that has been given is by common consent what we have in the Bible. Our experience leads us to believe that it will always be so with any people that comes to know the Bible. It is sufficient, because it gives us all we need to know to find God and our souls' salvation. It can be supplemented, but it can never be superseded, because the way it shows

is the right way, the way which actually gets us to the true and ultimate goal of human life, if only we follow it faithfully. Above all, it is the supreme revelation because it is the means by which we know Jesus Christ, Himself the Word made flesh, the Way, the Truth and the Life. So we as Christians believe, and that is what it means to say that the Bible is the Word of God.

With this understanding of the meaning of revelation, inspiration and authority, what can we say as to the fact, abundantly demonstrated by archaeology, that the culture and even the religion of the Hebrews and early Christians were not anything entirely new, distinct and different from the faith and practice of other peoples of the ancient world, but integrally related to the life and ideas of those times? Well, the discovery that the language of the New Testament was not a unique, sacred dialect, especially created for the communication of divine truth, but the common tongue of the Hellenistic world, has made it mean not less but more to us. So also the larger orientation of the Bible in the thought and life of the ancient world gives it greater reality and significance. The net result is not to level down the religious teaching and ideals of the Bible to the common plane of well-known, generally accepted ideas. Actually our new understanding brings out, with stereoscopic sharpness, the amazing originality and superiority of the distinctive messages of the Bible. We must not, of course, confuse value and novelty. An authentic revelation must give not what is new but what is true. With no over-anxious craving for novelty and difference, however, we may still be profoundly grateful when we find that the faith of the prophets and apostles is as distinctive as it is inspiring.

Such dependence upon Babylonian, Egyptian or Canaanite sources as may be found in the Bible falls on the whole into the category of form rather than essential content. Even where the content itself may be derived from foreign sources, as it seems to have been occasionally, this does not deprive it of authenticity or value as revelation, for we can hardly deny the Spirit the right to inspire writers among other peoples than the Hebrews, or to direct a Hebrew writer to already existing and effective expressions of the truth to be conveyed. Usually, however, the dependence is merely a matter of literary allusion, poetic structure or some current, traditional conception in terms of which we find a new spiritual insight.

Echoes of ancient myths in the stories of Genesis, made evident by comparison with Babylonian documents, are less surprising than the ex-

alted new conception of the one Lord of heaven and earth which the Hebrew writers were able to convey in the earthen vessels of current ideas. From the standpoint of the twentieth century A. D. we may feel that the story of Eve's creation from one of Adam's ribs implies too much subordination of woman to man, but when the story is read in the context of ancient presuppositions we can feel the radical boldness of the idea that woman is no beast of burden or inferior creature, but man's own bone and flesh, able to give him the companionship which no other being in creation can give.

Sharper distinctions within the Bible itself appear when we read it in the light of our new knowledge of its social and cultural environment. It becomes evident that the faith and the moral and social demands expressed in the Bible are far above the actual practice and belief of the ordinary Israelite or the official state cult. Many of the closest contacts with the religions of other peoples appear in the actual religion of the nation, which is severely condemned by the prophets and legislators. The Bible is not simply a history of ancient religion; it reveals a divine judgment on the religion as it existed and a divine demand which was never realized in history. The Bible tells much of what religion has been, but much more of what it ought to be. The more conscious we become of the close kinship between Israelite religion and the religion of the Canaanites, the more we appreciate the difference between the religion of the people and the lofty vision of the prophets, psalmists and lawgivers of the Old Testament. The same is true of Hellenistic echoes in the New Testament.

Thus by comparison with contemporary ideas and practices of the ancient world we are better able to tell what really was new and distinctive in the Bible. Recognition of the time-conditioned forms in which the revelation was expressed brings out the timelessness and eternal timeliness of the message itself. And while novelty and uniqueness are by no means the criteria by which truth is to be determined or the reality of revelation to be judged, it is a fact that what is valid and important for us, what finds us and commands our obedience, turns out to be what was actually newest and most distinctive at the time when it was written. We have the treasure in earthen vessels, but it is still treasure, and more precious than ever.

The Church and Returning Veterans

CHESTER A. PENNINGTON

A CHAPLAIN, stationed—in transit, they call it—several thousand miles from home, often finds himself thinking of “the home church.” His mind runs back to his last parish, and he feels the sad thrill of nostalgia. More often, however, he thinks of “the home church” in a general sense—not only the ones he served, but the ones he has seen in the towns and cities near camps at which he has been stationed, the thousands of churches which are “the home church” to millions of servicemen, a few of whom he has known and served. It is no longer nostalgia which disturbs him, but concern: concern whether the churches at home are readying themselves for the task of winning returning veterans to a Christian allegiance; concern whether the home churches even realize what their job will really be in the much-heralded “postwar world.”

THE DECEITFULNESS OF “FOXHOLE RELIGION”

Personally, I find it distressing that so many people seem to be putting so much reliance on what has been called “foxhole religion.” I have not been in intimate contact with home for some time and therefore am not quite sure how strong this tide of feeling now runs. There have been honest attempts to deflate the rising, pious optimism occasioned by the popularizing of the general theme that “there are no atheists in foxholes”; but I have recently run across evidence that this still represents a fairly common hope. Many pious people are evidently expecting a rebirth of religion to come out of the critical experiences of this war. They believe that men facing danger automatically turn to God; that this reaction is a permanent and deep-rooted conversion; and that consequently there will be a great resurgence of interest in the Church when the veterans come marching home.

I am firmly convinced that this is a false hope. Admittedly, it has sometimes been fostered by popular accounts of battle experiences; but I think it is an unrealistic interpretation of the facts. I confess that I have not been under fire and therefore am liable to the charge of not knowing what I am talking about. However, I have been in an area where men are readying for the fight and returning from it; and I find little evidence

of a rebirth of religious concern among the servicemen I see. This does not at all imply that there have not been—and will yet be—many glorious instances of genuine conversion; certainly the crises of war are thrusting some men into religious experiences which they might not otherwise have found. However, these are the exceptions rather than the rule. The vast majority of men who confront dangers of the “fox-hole” variety never undergo any lasting, life-changing revolution which the Church knows as conversion.

The caliber of this “faith under fire” can best be seen in the words which a young man, just back from one of the bitterest of the Pacific battles, used to express his religious feelings on the occasion: “You just know that there’s Somebody out there looking after you.” Two facts ought to be noted about this remark. First, it is just another way of saying, “I was lucky,” except that instead of calling it luck one calls it Providence. On the surface, it may sound like good Calvinism; but it is really fatalism. This is apparent when one considers the second fact that generally there is no moral regeneration accompanying this “religious” feeling. One needs no further evidence of this than a casual stroll through the less savory sections of any “liberty town.” And I think that most Christian people will agree that what we need is not more “religiousness” but downright sincere Christian living.

DANGERS WITHOUT FOXHOLES

There is yet another consideration which the home church must face; and this is probably more important than the foregoing discussion. Many people seem to overlook the fact that the greater percentage of servicemen are never actually under fire; and unless something unusual happens, most of us never will be. It is a comparatively small proportion who ever have to dive into foxholes to seek shelter from exploding shells or face the deadly fire of rifle and mortar. It is the lot of most of us to do our job far behind the scene of action, miles removed from danger, getting our war via newspaper, radio and tales told by veterans. Obviously this large number of men will never be scared into religion by the crises of the war. The influences to which they are exposed are quite different from the ones which are usually publicized; and, in the observation of this chaplain, they are far from conducive to any sort of religious awakening.

What are the dominant influences that play on the character of the serviceman behind the lines: The loneliness of being separated from home and loved ones (and it gets worse as time goes on); the tendency to relax moral standards ("Who will see you so far from home" or "Tomorrow we may be on our way to some God-forsaken place"); the boredom of doing a job which must be done but which one would rather not be doing (there are very few servicemen who would not rather be something else, somewhere else). And there is another factor: the unnormal (I will not say abnormal) influence of an exclusively masculine environment. In many ways, this is a delightful experience: lots of fun of the masculine variety. But in other ways, coupled with the foregoing factors, plus the influence of worldly-wise minds upon younger minds, it can be surprisingly demoralizing. Men who had always been decorous in speech become careless and coarse in their use of common vulgarisms; men who had never drunk before learn to seek the "joys of alcohol" without learning how to handle the stuff, while many who drank temperately are over-indulging; and men of formerly chaste habits discover the dubious thrills to be found in the arms of loose women.

It appears certain to me that this war will not occasion any wholesale revival of religion. If anything, the general result of these war experiences will be a cooling of religious interest and a relaxing of moral effort. Has it not always been thus? Then why should we expect this war to be different? There will be some servicemen who will return to their home churches with a new sense of God's presence in their lives and a new dedication to His service. But the typical returning veteran will be a man, hungry for the comforts of home, the security of a "normal" life, and the excitement of common indulgences, but gravely skeptical about the importance of religion (if he thinks about it at all) and uneasily dubious about traditional moral standards (if he has not already discarded them).

Does the local church realize that this man represents its most serious postwar problem? Do the churches know what they can do to win this man to a Christian faith and practice? He may never even come to church, except for a memorial service. But if he does, will the Church be able to claim his attention and win his allegiance? These are the questions which trouble this chaplain as, from within the armed forces, he considers the task of the churches at home.

IF THE VETERAN GOES TO CHURCH

The whole problem may be stated very bluntly. When he comes home, what will the returning veteran find in his own home church? The issue may be pictured thus. The young man comes back from the war something of a hero; however, he never lets on that within himself he is somewhat confused about a lot of things, and perhaps even secretly ashamed of certain indiscretions; he tries to carry on as if everything were just about the same. Then comes the day when his family suggests that he go to church with them. He goes, hiding his secret doubts, confusion and uneasiness. Here arises the critical question which the local church must face: What will this young veteran find when he comes to our church?

He will not expect all ministers and members to be great scholars; but he will expect them to have a reasonable faith and strong convictions concerning the basic issues of life. He will be confused at many points; lots of questions have been raised in his mind and many beliefs challenged. Will the Church speak with quiet certainty to his troubled mind?

He will not expect all ministers and members to be saints (he certainly will be disgusted if they are hollowly pious); but he will expect them to be serious and honest in their normal effort. He has seen much of moral carelessness and deceit; moral principles have been flouted before his eyes and probably shaken in his mind. Will the Church, by the encouragement of its examples, win him to renewed conviction and effort?

He will not expect the Church to be playing partisan politics or campaigning for social radicalism; but he will expect it to be vigorously opposed to social injustices and forthright in its demands for an equitable scheme of things.

He will not expect the Church to be a faultless association of people; but he will expect them to be working together without obvious jealousies and petty bickerings. He has seen enough of selfish and conflicting interests; he will look for something better in the churches—after all, they preach about it. Will he find it?

If he goes to church when he comes home, this is what the veteran will look for: in the pulpit, men of strong faith, courageous convictions, social vision, transparent sincerity; in the pew, men of intelligent, informed faith and obviously sincere life. If he does not find them, you can depend on it, he will not bother to come again.

It ought to be emphasized that this is the concern of the local church. One cannot push the responsibility on to a Council of Bishops, synod, conference or some other denominational authority. They have their importance, of course. But when G.I. Joe (no longer G.I.) considers whether the Church has anything to offer him, he will not study what this committee or that council has to say about such and such a matter. He will go to the church in his home town, sit in a familiar pew, and will judge the church and its message by what he sees right there. Does this preacher have anything to say—and does he mean it?

THE IMMEDIATE TASK

It appears to me that the Church must begin now to prepare itself for the great task which lies ahead—the same task which has always confronted it: the proclamation of the gospel, the renewal of personal life by means of that gospel and the common fellowship, and the gradual influencing (as leaven) of the wider circles of society. And in the final analysis, it becomes a matter not simply for the individual church but for the individual Christian. He must ask not simply, "Is my church the right kind of church?" but also "Am I the right kind of person?" For the influence of the Church is nothing more than the total influence of the people who belong to it. What then must be done? First, the people who call themselves Christians must prove themselves to be persons of deep faith and sincere practice. Second, these Christians must learn to live and work together harmoniously within their church fellowship. Third, the power and influence of this faith and fellowship must make itself felt in the wider social relationships of these persons.

And all this must begin *now*—not when the war is over. It is a vain hope to expect the returning veterans to inject new life into the Church. If the Church is not alive when they come home, it will soon find itself fighting for its very existence in a period of decadence such as it never dreamed possible. If it is alive and awake, it may have a chance of winning a few men and exerting a little influence on the shape of things to come. But the future lies solely in the hands of every minister and church member. It is up to each one to strengthen his faith, discipline his life, broaden his vision—*NOW*. It may be that, seeing such church members, some returning veterans will say, "Maybe the Church has something to offer, after all."

The Crux of Christian Ethics

ALBAN G. WIDGERY

HAVE we any justification for continuing to use the term "Christian" ethics? Probably it has never occurred to the readers of this publication to raise that question. But it has been raised, and today when there is so much agreement between exponents of "ethics" and "Christian ethics," the bases of an affirmative answer require clear statement. It has been maintained that if so-called Christian ethics is investigated with sincere regard to what is valid, then it should coincide with what is honestly arrived at in ethics in general. It is asserted that there is no more need for talking of "Christian" ethics than there is of "Christian" mathematics. Nevertheless, while the latter term is not used, the former continues to be employed, and, it is urged, with sufficient justification. One type of defense, which I adopted in my own book, *Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life* (1940), is that Christian ethics is constituted in the moral ideals in Christian literature and institutions in the course of Christian history. But even so, it is necessary to indicate something in Christian ethics which distinguishes it from non-Christian systems. The question as to what differentiates it from other systems constitutes the crux of Christian ethics. This is a subject which requires definite consideration today.

We are presented in modern times with a Christian ethics of "the abundant life." The saying, accredited to Jesus: "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly," is being interpreted to include the values of earthly existence. The most modern expositions of Christian ethics insist that men should strive for the physical and cultural values of life; should endeavor to obtain economic and political organizations which will promote and secure these for all; and should oppose those, whether within or outside of one's own country who obstruct their general achievement. They insist on full recognition of individual and social welfare in the widest possible sense. Acknowledging this world as God's world, modern Christian ethics emphasizes the joys of living in contrast with medieval Catholic asceticism and its Protestant successor, Puritanism. The "Social Gospel" of the last decades has had as a central motive the promotion of terrestrial well-being for all.

In this we find the important contemporary *agreement* of Christian with other ethics. It is definitely contended that there are no values of life, physical or cultural, advocated so ardently by proponents of modern "humanism" and "ethical culture," which are not acknowledged and striven for by Christians. Indeed, nothing seems to perturb some humanists more than to have it pointed out to them that modern Christian ethics explicitly recognizes all the positive values for which humanists stand: that they have nothing positive to offer which Christianity does not offer. Humanists have been inclined to argue that the Christian reliance on God has lessened self-reliance. This is not in accordance with Christian theory, nor is it true for Christian practice. Though Christian morality, associated with Christianity as religion, goes along with the belief (in general discarded and even opposed by modern humanists) that man needs divine aid, it calls for the utmost men may do for themselves by individual action and social co-operation. It is also asserted that the Christian belief in a future life has unduly diverted attention from this life. But that belief does not logically imply that the values of this life are to be neglected, and in practice it is the exception rather than the rule that it leads to such neglect among Christians. Christians charge the humanists with an inadequate view of "human nature," upon which they base their position. Christian ethics claims to go beyond humanism in the recognition that human nature is such that man cannot attain complete satisfaction without the love of God.

Nevertheless, the acknowledgment of a need of divine aid, the acceptance of a belief in a future life, and the insistence on the moral necessity for a love of God, do not provide us with a justification for the use of the term "Christian" ethics. A non-Christian theistic philosophical ethics may admit all of these. To find the distinction, resort cannot be appropriately made to aspects of Christianity as religion, particularly its traditional dogmas. For the question is specifically concerned with the ideals, values, constituents, of the moral life as such. Recent exponents of Christian ethics have tended to restrict themselves to these, and maintain that it is both possible and necessary to consider Christian morality apart from practices and doctrines that may be considered specifically religious. Undoubtedly, Christians will rightly urge that their moral lives are lived in community with their fellow Christians in the Church, and in relation with their devotion to Jesus and to the Father. Of the utmost importance as this is, it does not characterize Christian

ethics: it simply indicates that Christianity is not merely a form of morality.

There is, however, one doctrine, proclaimed by not a few Christian theologians, which may be regarded as of ethical significance different from, even opposed to the teaching of contemporary non-Christian ethics. This is the doctrine of the "total depravity" of human nature. Some may think that in this doctrine lies the basis of the distinctiveness of Christian ethics. But there are modern expositions of Christian ethics in which this doctrine is discarded.¹ Nevertheless, many exponents of Christianity even today are constantly making that doctrine a starting point of their expositions or bringing it to the center of attention. I have personally met some who seem almost as though they get a grim satisfaction from the present belligerent state of the world as confirming this doctrine. My conviction is that many of the educated of modern mankind, if they reflect on this doctrine, are more inclined to accept humanism without it, or, if lay church members decide to ignore it. Fortunately, it is probable that most of the uneducated within and outside the Church rarely or never think about it. Even theologians appear to occupy themselves with the doctrine mainly as an idea bound up (in their minds) with certain dogmas they wish to maintain concerning Christian redemption and the nature of the Person of Jesus Christ. It is crucial for a modern Christian ethics that the description of human nature as "totally depraved" (an ecclesiastical continuance of ancient mythology brought within the scope of the dignified title of "Dogmatic Theology") shall be abandoned.

Christian ethics, as humanist and other philosophical ethics, must implicate a view of human nature as evident in historical experience, and not be bound up with ideas generated for other than ethical purposes. Better for us to give up all support for "Christian" ethics than to give ground for the impression that the Church goes on teaching the doctrine of "total depravity" to arouse fear in men as to their desperate condition, so that the Church shall be continued with its organization, its priests and rites, as the only established means by which the condition is to be changed. The Church has a significance and worth both for religion and for morality quite apart from any dependence on this doctrine. Though humanism is to be preferred in that it does not thus slander

¹ For example, Professor A. C. Knudson's *The Principles of Christian Ethics* (1943), as well as my own book mentioned above.

human nature, Christian ethics has a wider view and a higher ideal of human nature than humanism, for it acknowledges man's capacities for devotion to, love and worship of God.

If mankind, before the rise of Christianity and in non-Christian countries after that, had been more depraved than not, its history with the many-sided developments of civilization and religion could not have occurred. If the war conditions of the world today be taken to confirm the belief that mankind is more depraved than not, it may be asked upon what the hope underlying the great efforts to conquer the evils depends. Christians, in that regard, may and do admit reliance upon God: but in contrast with the unhealthy belief in total depravity taught by some theologians, they have a healthy conviction that there is a dominance of men of good will and that through their good efforts in co-operation with God the good will triumphs. One does not (or should not) endeavor to rouse a man to rational action by telling him he is fundamentally insane; nor to physical activity by assuring him that he is radically diseased; nor to moral life by teaching him he is morally depraved. On the basis of experience upon which the issue should be judged, the majority of mankind cannot rightly be described as more irrational than rational; as more diseased than not. Nor on the basis of experience can one rightly say that the majority of mankind have been or are more morally depraved than not. Instead of thus acknowledging actual experience the theologians who maintain the doctrine are concerned with adhering to an obsolete idea. Not only must that doctrine not be regarded as the distinctive in Christian ethics: it must be eliminated from Christian ethics. No one concerned with ethics, Christian or non-Christian, has ever supposed that man is without defects. What the Church has stood for, and stands for today, as concerns morality, can be considered from the standpoint shared by all ethics: that mankind as we know it strives for something better than it at present experiences.

It is not infrequently thought that the essential difference between Christian and other systems of ethics is to be found in the Christian ideal of love. But however central this idea may have been for Jesus, He Himself referred to it in two passages from the Jewish religion of the Old Testament. There is also a genuine sense in which love may be claimed to be taught as an ideal by Buddhism. Theists who have no concern with Christianity may acknowledge it. The distinction between Christian and non-Christian ethics has been further described as

lying in the relative emphasis which the former gives to the different values of life as contrasted with the relative emphasis given by the latter. There is undoubtedly a tendency for humanists to give relatively more attention to physical well-being and to social conduct than to qualities of personal character. Christianity, with its usual belief in a future life, definitely stresses personal character with its enduring worth. The humanists may accord importance to character, but they do so generally as instrumental to social life and economic welfare. They may consider cultural values, as beauty and truth, as above pleasures of the body. The non-Christian theist may believe in a future life and give as great emphasis to personal character as the Christian does. So, though the relative emphasis on different values is of the utmost importance for Christian ethics, it must be admitted that it is not an adequate basis for the distinction we are concerned with.

Professor Brightman pointed out that my book did not differentiate between Christian and a possible non-Christian theistic ethics. I now wish to acknowledge that the reply I then gave to him was unsatisfactory. Such significance as the present paper may have is in the presentation of the view to which, after further reflection I have now arrived. If admitted, it must involve a considerable change of impression of my treatment as a whole. It is best to state at once, briefly, my present way of looking at the problem. This is, that the distinctive in Christian ethics is in the manner in which it regards suffering and the part it insists that suffering has in the moral life. I am inclined to the view that no non-Christian ethics, whether secularly or religiously conceived, has given the same kind of consideration to suffering. The only other religion which has given a partial recognition of some aspects of what is involved in Christianity in this regard is Mahayana Buddhism in its doctrine of the Boddhisattvas. But this is restricted to suffering (apparently) endured by the Boddhisattvas to bring salvation to others. In general, the Oriental doctrine of karma, in all its varied forms, recognizes suffering only as a natural penal consequence of wrongdoing. Christian ethics includes a thoroughgoing appreciation of the place of suffering in human life and of the moral attitudes to be assumed toward it. It insists on vicarious suffering, though more explicitly than Buddhism, and it admits some retributive suffering, though perhaps not so precisely as the doctrine of karma implies. But it also covers suffering which comes to mankind without any conscious purpose on its part to help others, and without

any evident relation to wrongdoing. Much of the physical suffering which comes to men from the processes of physical nature is of this kind. There is also such mental suffering as grief and sorrow—clearly not a consequence of sin and often quite devoid of any feature of being vicariously of benefit to others. It is this treatment of suffering which differentiates Christian ethics from humanist ethics, non-Christian theistic ethics and from the ethics of the other great religions of the world.

It is interesting to inquire why some recent writers on Christian ethics have failed to give due recognition to this fact, which, when mentioned, may seem to many to be almost amazingly obvious. I can speak simply for myself. I believe that through being repelled by the traditional doctrines of redemption associated with the suffering of Jesus, my attention was turned away from this fundamental aspect of Christian ethics. On the other hand, that attention became so largely occupied with the task of presenting Christian ethics as including the physical and cultural values of earthly life, the significance of which the Christian ethics of earlier ages had too heavily discounted. This defect of mine indicates a difficult situation for the exponents of Christian ethics. It shows the need of a clear appreciation of the Christian view of suffering in and for the moral life, divorced from the theological doctrines that have been developed with reference to the sufferings of Jesus. Whether those doctrines be accepted or not, it may be urged that Christian ethics embodies fundamental and distinctive teachings concerning suffering.

The implications concerning suffering are incorporated in the whole Christian picture. They are given expression in many passages of the New Testament. It may be questioned whether any other than Christian ethics (or any system owing debts to it, as, for example, one form of Hegelian Idealism) have any principle analogous to: "He that would save his life must lose it." Jesus has been described as "the Man of Sorrows." But nowhere is the significance of suffering more definitely insisted on than in *The Imitation of Christ*, though one may reasonably contend that in that book it is exaggerated. "In the Cross is the sum of virtue." "If there had been anything better and more profitable to man's salvation than suffering, Christ would surely have shown it by word and example. . . . He plainly exhorts to carry the Cross" (Book II, xii, 5).

To understand the Christian position it is of the utmost importance to grasp its entire range and its general quality. It can be urged that

non-Christian ethics do not entirely ignore suffering. Quite apart from Christianity it is acknowledged that in acts of courage for the welfare of others some suffering or the possibility or probability of suffering is accepted voluntarily. Even the Nazis and the Fascists call on individuals to face suffering and death. Their motive, however, is always for the defense or aggrandizement of the particular race or State. In neither of these, nor in general ethics, is the fact of suffering in the moral refinement of the individual or in the promotion of profound social feeling adequately recognized. As by most forms of non-Christian ethics it is insisted that men suffer in consequence of their own wrong acts. "As a man sows, so shall he reap." Such suffering can and is to be avoided by abstention from wrongdoing. It is also admitted, as most Occidental systems agree, that men suffer from the wrongdoing of others. But not all human suffering is due to such human causes.

With its relatively greater emphasis on the more enduring values of personal character as compared with the more or less transitory values of the physical body and of culture, Christian ethics stresses the significance of suffering in the refinement and strengthening of personality. Some, with little and only superficial reflection, may at times think that mankind would rather have it otherwise. The teaching of Christianity appears to be more in accordance with the actualities of life. Even in so simple an affair as two football teams coming together for a game, it may be said with little if any doubt, that if given the opportunity of having a decision between them either by tossing a coin or by actual play, the choice would be for the latter in spite of the hard effort and even the possibility of bodily hurt. Christian ethics has grasped the truth that personal character is highly estimated in that it is achieved partly through suffering. What the humanist and the ordinary sociologist too often fail to see is that the individual's sufferings not infrequently have more importance for him personally than they have either directly or indirectly for social life.

Philosophers, and among these many of the religious philosophers of India, have presented to mankind an aim of unity, but more often than not they have described this as a unity of thought or of mystical identity of man with God. Modern humanists have much to say of unity in terms of social solidarity, but it is described chiefly with reference to social co-operation for the achievement of economic and culture values. Christianity has presented the ideal of a community of persons. Though

it may admit something mystical in this relationship, the personal reality of the individuals is not considered as lost or as transcended. This unity, involving thought and action, is predominantly one of feeling. Community is experienced in shared joy and happiness. But suffering also may and does unite persons in close bonds. In the Christian moral life we rejoice together. But we also suffer together, and together we enter into that social love through which our common sufferings are able to be borne. There are not a few who would maintain that the bonds of human fellowship are stronger when they have been forged at least in part in the fires of suffering. There are not a few who have been drawn into closer relationship with Jesus and into effort to live in accordance with his teaching, on account of their impression of the suffering He endured.

With all that it involves concerning suffering Christian ethics gives no suggestion that men should give rise to suffering just in order to obtain the benefits which its endurance is alleged to offer. Self-torture is not approved. The medieval self-infliction of suffering must be considered a distortion. The cruel sufferings of imprisonment and the rack, the thumbscrew and the stake deliberately inflicted by the authorities under the direction of the Inquisition—in suppression of freedom of speech—were caused in violation of Christian ethics. Nor has Christianity ever taught any abstention from or minimizing of efforts to relieve or to eradicate the causes of physical suffering. Jesus went about to heal the sick. A similar aim has been and is a prominent one in the Christian life. Yet, on the other hand, the infliction of necessary suffering is not to be avoided: the Christian is not to suppress the truth that should be told, or to resort to falsehood, because the truth may be "painful." For there are occasions, in the circumstances in which we live in this world, when suffering must be voluntarily inflicted and endured. To decide what those occasions are requires very careful judgment: surely the effort for free intellectual inquiry against which the Inquisition acted was not one of them.

Acknowledging suffering as near the center of the moral life, Christian ethics sees in this a basis for the understanding of the fact that the physical world of nature has been created or has evolved in such fashion as to involve suffering for mankind. In the light of the moral acceptance of suffering, that nature does not provide "a bed of roses" for mankind is seen to give nature itself an ethical significance, which otherwise it

would not have. Some of those aspects of nature which have led to its being described as nonmoral, even immoral, actually give it ethical importance. For, from this standpoint, in that it gives rise to some human suffering, it is allied with the distinctively moral.

There may come a time when there will be no suffering: but certainly neither the humanist nor any other can give us indubitable evidence that there will be. The Christian may have faith that God in His own good time "will wipe away all tears." That is not yet: nor have we any good grounds for believing it soon will be. Suffering is still with us, and whatever steps we take to minimize or to eradicate it, is likely long to remain so. According to Christian ethics, our moral development involves that we still need it. It may be futile, even unwise, for any to try entirely to escape it. "Thou canst not escape it," says *The Imitation*, "whithersoever thou runnest. . . . Turn thyself upwards; turn thyself downwards; turn thyself outwards; turn thyself inwards: everywhere thou shalt find the cross; and everywhere thou must needs keep patience, if thou wilt have inward peace and earn an everlasting crown" (Book II, xii, 1).

If suffering cannot be escaped entirely, the essential and the truly distinctive for Christian ethics is the attitude toward it. That is fundamental. For it is quite evident that suffering may, and too often does, embitter instead of ennoble, weaken instead of strengthen. In face of suffering a man may "curse" God or nature, complain of and abuse his fellow men. There is a just condemnation of those who cause us unnecessary suffering. However, Christianity teaches some submission to God in suffering: "Not my will, but Thine be done." It implies what the late B. H. Streeter called "the conversion of suffering." "It is not suffering, but the way it is borne that ennobles." Once again *The Imitation* makes clear the Christian attitude: "If thou carry the Cross cheerfully, it will carry thee and lead thee to the desired end of suffering: though here there shall be none. If thou carry it unwillingly, thou makest for thyself a burden and addest to thy load: and yet thou must bear. If thou cast away one cross, without doubt thou shalt find another, and perhaps a heavier. Thinkest thou to escape what no mortal could ever avoid?" (Book II, xii, 2).

The difference between the Christian and non-Christian attitude is implied in Earl Russell's essay, entitled *The Free Man's Worship*. One is rightly impressed by its bold challenge to evil: the determination to

fight evil and to endeavor to achieve the good. Throughout history there have been many Christians who have fought evils as forcefully as his language expresses. In that regard there is no difference between his attitude and that of Christian ethics. Evil is taken seriously, as Christianity also takes it. But those conscious of the Christian spirit may find in the essay no ethical acceptance of suffering such as Christianity involves: rather they may sense something of arrogant defiance. Yet, though he has valiantly fought, and still fights, Earl Russell is unlikely to have escaped, or to escape, suffering in life: and he knows that he goes on to inevitable death. His fight will have failed insofar as something or other will prevent him from further enjoyment of the goods of life for which he has fought. He may say that he will "be" no longer, and so not conscious of the loss. But, no more than Hamlet can he be absolutely certain of the answer to the question whether after death one is "to be or not to be." It is not impossible that in some future existence Earl Russell may have to learn the truth of the Christian attitude, that though there is much suffering against which we should fight, there is some that we must accept for our own purgation and for our innermost unity with our fellow men.

Thus, if we may so put it: the crux of Christian ethics is the cross. The cross has become the symbol of Christianity as religion: it may also be considered the symbol of Christianity as an ethical system. But the cross does not cover all that Christianity is, whether as religion or as morality. In Christianity as religion, the idea of resurrection implies triumph over crucifixion and death. The cross, though it indicates what is distinctive in Christian ethics—and though it could not be appropriately used for any other system of ethics—does not stand for its central or dominant idea. Surely there is a loss of perspective in the statement of *The Imitation*: "Thou art deceived if thou seek ought else than to suffer tribulation" (Book II, xii, 2). Suffering is not central, but it is near the center. Suffering is subordinate to the aim of the abundant life in the pursuit of which it appears to be an inescapable necessity. Central for Christian ethics is the ideal of a triumphant love. So, in conclusion, it may be urged that the cross is an inadequate symbol either for the Christian religion or for Christian ethics. Should we not rather have a cross surmounted by a crown of victory?

How to Read Thomas Mann

CLARENCE SEIDENSPINNER

THOMAS MANN is now a legend in contemporary literature. The recent publication of *Joseph the Provider* completed the great prose-epic upon which he labored for a decade. It also brought to our attention again the wonder of all that he has done.

In spite of the fact that everyone knows the name of Thomas Mann, not everyone is familiar in a firsthand way with his work. To be sure, everyone has heard about the Joseph cycle, the proportions of which have reached over 2,000 pages in a tetralogy of novels now completed by *Joseph the Provider*. Everyone knows that he has written *The Magic Mountain*, one of the most comprehensive novels of the century. Many of us know that Doctor Mann was awarded the Nobel prize in literature in 1930, that he has become an exile from his native Germany which destroyed the freedom of the human spirit within its bounds and drove its independent thinkers into other countries, that now he is at work in the United States as a member of the staff of the Library of Congress and as an artist whose name has taken on those overtones which accrue to the legendary giants of the past.

In spite of the excellent translations of his books by Mrs. H. T. Lowe-Porter and others, there is a certain natural hesitation on the part of the average man in picking them up to read. He names the titles but is reluctant to open the covers. One hesitates to impute this to the average reader's laziness and lack of sporting blood, for these books are unique on the library shelf. They offer an intellectual adventure fraught with such pitfalls at the start as to cause the reader to shake his head in dismay and put the volume aside for a more propitious moment. With a little guidance, however, the adventure can be made, the books read and the reader make the personal discovery that Thomas Mann is indeed superb, a giant among our contemporaries.

The anemic mind indeed will do well to forget Doctor Mann, for a certain courage and intellectual vigor are required in reading these robust books which portray fundamental human problems. Not that they are dull and grim. By no means, for they are lightened on every page by rippling humor, warm human sympathy and situations of deep psychological interest. Once the crust is broken, once the purposes stand

out clearly, once the nuances of thought and expression become familiar, the reading itself becomes a fascinating and electric experience.

His literary essays and political polemics need no guide for their understanding. The meaning of such an address as *The Coming Victory of Democracy* is clear to everyone. These essays reveal in action a mind both critical and passionate. It is rather the narrative material, profoundly creative and moving, that is more difficult at first, and more rewarding too. It can be grouped into three divisions, each group bringing into relief a distinct phase of the cultural problem.

The moment Thomas Mann assumed the mantle of the storyteller he was confronted with the enigma of the artist's nature. This was not only a theoretical problem for the young writer, but a practical one too, for he had chosen his life's work. Should the artist lead a life of irresponsibility to society? Should he lose himself, as Oscar Wilde and Whistler were doing, in the cult of art for art's sake? This was the popular bourgeois conception of the artist, a type thoroughly bohemian and decadent. Upon this conception Thomas Mann pours his ridicule in his early novel, *Buddenbrooks*.

Should the artist rebound to the other extreme and distil a lean art from a stern, ascetic life that abandons the normal joys and experiences of the bourgeoisie? No, says Thomas Mann, and in his novelette, *Death in Venice*, he portrays the danger of icy asceticism. Essentially, this story is a psychological study of discipline and repression. The author-hero of the story, Aschenbach, who repressed for years his erotic and natural tendencies, found himself growing stale. Hoping to recapture his creative ability he took a Venetian vacation, but under the warm sun and in this exotic atmosphere the long-repressed emotions broke with terrible crescendo through the dams of consciousness and brought him to his ruin.

What then? In another novelette now a classic, the young writer, Tonio Kröger, states the solution of this cultural problem. The artist is to lead a normal bourgeois life, for in these ordinary experiences of love and family life and community responsibility the artist finds his deepest inspiration. Upon this solution Thomas Mann has built his own life, a life so tenderly revealed in the stories *A Man and His Dog*, and *Disorder and Early Sorrow*.

The second phase of Thomas Mann's discussion of the cultural problem is his now famous novel, *The Magic Mountain*. It is a critical commentary upon our contemporary world, a commentary upon which

many a reader has broken his intellectual lance. Now if ever, the reader needs a guide. Let the following suggestions be borne in mind and *The Magic Mountain* will be one of the most rewarding intellectual experiences he has ever had.

In discussing Goethe, Doctor Mann points out two factors which condition the life of the writer: perception and a feeling for form. These factors are crystallized to a superb degree in *The Magic Mountain*. It is a great perception: the world is terribly sick and sickness means disintegration and death. This is the fundamental accent of the whole 900 pages.

The novel is also a great form. It is nothing less than a symphonic musical composition in prose, a thought texture woven together of a number of themes or *leitmotifs*. Just as in symphonic composition two or more themes are woven in and out of one another and blended together in new variations, each one resounding upon itself and gaining resonance throughout the symphony; so in *The Magic Mountain* certain basic thought motifs are introduced to resound again and again throughout the novel and to give it a most marvelous symphonic texture.

Two of these thought motifs are introduced at the very beginning. One of them is Hans Castorp, a typical bourgeois from the world, who goes up to the magic mountain, to an international tuberculosis sanatorium in the Swiss Alps to visit his cousin. Once up there he discovers that he has tuberculosis himself and must remain. He then becomes the pedagogic excuse for everything that is introduced into the novel. He is the typical product of our age and we are enabled through him to watch the effect of our contemporary world upon the bourgeois mind.

The second theme or thought motif is time. Just as Egdon Heath in Thomas Hardy's novel, *The Return of the Native*, may be considered one of the characters; so time may be thought of as a living force in *The Magic Mountain*. It mingles and reacts with the other characters and has a definite effect upon their consciousness.

We may say that Hans Castorp becomes a victim of the space-time manifold. As he ascends the mountainous Alps with their far-flung fantastic stretches of space, and as he settles down in the sanatorium where the unit of time is the month instead of the day and the cure extends year after year, his here-and-now becomes blurred. Space and time are of no account up here. Everything is dissolved in the unbroken uniformity of the Alpine mists. In these extravagant distances and during

these protracted periods of uniformity in the sanatorium, Hans Castorp loses the perception of space and time. This results in organic and psychological weakness, in a certain inability to take command of his destiny. As we read, now with sympathy for Castorp and now with ridicule, we realize that Doctor Mann has expressed that which often we had felt but had never thought of crystallizing into words, the effect of space and time upon our own lives.

The third theme to make its appearance is the sanatorium itself. Many a reader breaks his lance at this point by failing to perceive that the sanatorium is a brilliant symbol of the world itself, that every occurrence up here is but a reflection of that which happens down below in the world. Up here sick people live insignificantly and speak in an exaggerated, hyperbolic key. Their bodies and minds are in a state of disintegration. They have no supreme and splendid purpose for which to live. As the years move on the spirit of malice becomes more and more apparent in their midst. Quarrels, departures and premature deaths result. All of which is symbolic of a world which has no significant answer to man's deepest questions, and which is rapidly plunging through mediocrity and illness to disintegration, war and catastrophe.

For those who read with open eyes, very early Thomas Mann gives us the clue to the novel in a paragraph which says: "A man lives not only his personal life, as an individual, but also, consciously or unconsciously, the life of his epoch and his contemporaries. . . . Now if the life about him, if his own time seem, however outwardly stimulating, to be at bottom empty of such food for his aspirations; if he privately recognize it to be hopeless, viewless, helpless, opposing only a hollow silence to all the questions man puts . . . as to the final, absolute and abstract meaning in all his efforts and activities; then, in such a case, a certain laming of the personality is bound to occur . . . a sort of palsy, as it were, which may even extend from his spiritual and moral over into his physical and organic part." The magic mountain was the reflection of this kind of an age.

This superficiality is crystallized in the speech of the guests and management of the magic mountain. One by one they bring into living form the major philosophies of our contemporary world. One by one they are introduced as new *leitmotifs* to mingle with the others in the development of the book's symphonic texture.

The reader must understand that the physician in charge, Hofrat

Behrens, is a philosophical mechanist who looks at life in terms of its physical and chemical structure. Settembrini is an engaging humanist who believes that mankind can lift itself by its own bootstraps to create the Beloved Community. He is the apostle of Progress and Enlightenment. Naphta is a dualist who believes that there is such an endless qualitative difference between God and man that mankind is impotent to raise the level of its own life, but must wait until God strikes with his apocalyptic lightning from the sky. Mynheer Peeperkorn, now one of the great characters in German literature, is the hedonist, the man who believes that human life is fulfilled in sensation, in the tender love of women and the fire of red wine. Neither singly nor collectively could these philosophies comfort and strengthen the soul in its need or prevent the world from plunging into the maelstrom of war. Here is the fundamental reason for the tragedy in which we are now involved.

The third phase of the cultural problem discussed by Thomas Mann is brought to brilliant and satisfying expression in the Joseph cycle. This tetralogy of novels constitutes a psychological exploration of primitive man, of adventurous and spirit-driven human nature in the dawn of time as *homo sapiens* rises from brute to man. If the modern age has nothing definite to say regarding the Soul, perhaps antiquity has.

The Joseph cycle is an even more startling time romance than *The Magic Mountain*. Indeed, many a reader sticks in the bog of *The Prelude* where he is plunged into the bottomless well of time, and he can get no further with the book. Unless he is acquainted with Thomas Mann through other books, he would do well to skip *The Prelude* when he first begins to read *Joseph and His Brothers*. Let him start with the narrative itself, with the chapter, By the Well, in which the story begins at a lovely moonlit hour with conversations between Jacob and Joseph. When the book has been read, then let the reader come to grips with *The Prelude*, after which he will be in a position to take on the other volumes in the cycle.

The Prelude takes us back to the strange dim world of Oriental antiquity, to the day when the individual was hardly aware of the passage of time, to that long, unbroken epoch when one time cycle dissolved into another without appreciable change on the earth. It is a breathtaking descent into hell, to the day when one was not sure whether Abram was his real grandsire or not, for beyond Abram was the real man from Ur who had left his native land to wander over the earth because he was restless and spirit driven. Yet beyond this man from Ur was the

original Abram, the real moon-man who set about his wanderings—and beyond him extended, God knows, how many who bore the name of Abram, each one fulfilling his destiny by recreating the pious satisfying formula of the past. Doctor Mann goes so far as to rearrange the biblical chronology, in order that the past may mingle with the present.

Stripped of its bourgeois trappings, essential human life stands out bold and clear. The reader becomes aware of the major experiences of the Soul: birth, food, love, struggle, victory, social fellowship, religion and at length, social responsibility. This is the mythology of human life, the patterns into which spirit-driven man relaxes, the answers to the great questions of the Soul for which Hans Castorp sought in vain.

Joseph, too, in contrast to his brothers, was spirit driven. His personality was more sharply accented than his father's, more subtle, sophisticated and complex. We watch him adjust himself to the rich civilization of the Nile and become an important participant in the national life. Is not this the whole story of the soul, as it becomes conscious of itself, of its destiny and blessing, of its uniqueness in the group and its important place in any highly developed civilization? Is not this our problem too? How shall we retain all the rights and freedom of a highly developed ego and still maintain our place in a co-operative social order which makes for brilliant civilization? This question, raised by *The Magic Mountain*, is answered by the Joseph cycle. Because of the perspective which the Joseph stories afford, we see how this can be done in a humane or spiritual way.

The Joseph cycle is also a study of the place of tradition in human life. The matter of tradition or myth profoundly interests Thomas Mann. He discusses it critically in his essay on "Freud and the Future," and in his address on the Joseph Novels, and uses it creatively in his novels.

Doctor Mann believes that tradition or the myth is the very foundation of existence. Human life always reaches toward it, for along with our individualism is our sense of the pattern, the form, the typical into which we want our lives to flow. For example, consider the family pattern which reproduces itself in each generation. Children grow up into adulthood, marry and beget children, and are amused to see the youngsters do the same things, express themselves through the same gestures and inflections which once upon a time the parent used. And when these adults become grandparents they are moved to laughter and

tears to see the third generation going through the same old motions again. And in this family pattern there is comfort and joy.

Sometimes a man may recognize his life to be a fresh incarnation of an ancient pattern, "the ever-becoming present of the memoried past." Then he becomes a participant in a "lived myth," a character in an old tale being reproduced again. Jacob and Joseph were always aware of this role. Playing their part in this "lived story," in this present reproduction of an ancient patterned past which now must be reproduced again like a liturgical mystery play, gave them great satisfaction, dignity and artistry in living. As we see the beauty which tradition and the mythos brings to them, we begin to understand the importance of tradition for us, particularly of that complex and wonderful mythos that comprises our Mediterranean-Christian civilization.

Inevitably, spirit-driven man discovers God and strives to please Him. The story of this discovery and the resultant religion is another important aspect of human life reflected in the Joseph cycle.

The Abraham tradition had developed a bond between God and man, one which was carefully treasured and nourished by Jacob, who was aware of the blessing upon his head. Never did he forget that awful day when he fled from home with Eliphaz in pursuit and that night when, shorn of his possessions, he slept with his head upon a stone and saw the navel chord of heaven and earth and all the astral watchers.

Jacob, as symbol of the human spirit, had much to learn about God. He did not always know that he dealt with a jealous God, one of passion and life to whom one owed supreme obedience and affection. So it was that when Benjamin was born, Rachael, the dearly loved, was taken from him. Then the love of Jacob for Rachael was given to Joseph, but still, Jacob does not learn, and Joseph, too, is taken away.

Joseph labors upon the godhead, too. As we read of his awkward beginning, we are reminded of the line from Thornton Wilder, "Of all the forms of genius, goodness has the longest awkward age." Joseph was thrown into the pit because his individualism took a snobbish rather than a social turn, because his dealings with God were playful rather than responsible. He learned these lessons after his deliverance, but was thrown into the pit again because his individualism and obedience to God had not been completely developed. He had failed to establish the proper relationship between body and mind, and so failed in the delicate matter of Potiphar's wife. Spirit driven, however, he learned.

Around this skeletal structure of meaning, the narrative is beautifully woven in a texture of warm sympathy, of pathos and delicate humor, of interest and suspense and excellent story-telling. It is an experiment in epic-prose, unique of its kind.

Contributory to these great studies of the human spirit are the secondary books in which Thomas Mann explores the nature of the soul. What, oh, what is man? Again and again Doctor Mann asks this question. Particularly is he interested in the anatomy of beauty and spirit, of body and mind, of nature and saintliness. What is the bond between these extremes? In an essay on Goethe and Tolstoy, who are contrasted to Schiller and Dostoyevsky, he explores the peculiar psychology of each type and looks upon Goethe—the Joseph type, as a harbinger of the middle way, the future man. This theme is further developed in his Goethe novel of 1940, *The Beloved Returns*. It is really a deep look into the fiery crucible of personality where body and spirit, art and life are fruitfully united, as they were in the case of Joseph.

This theme was given mythological expression in another contributory study, the beautiful novelette called *The Transposed Heads*. It is an Indian story of Sita who was in love with the spirit of one man and the body of another and who was able to effect a transposition of their heads, so that she might have a husband made up of principal parts! The story really asks the question, why raise a false dilemma concerning body and spirit? Must we have one or the other? Is it impossible to enjoy both?

Like all of the Mann novels, this tale has certain political implications. For example, the United States is now like the husband made up of principal parts. Once we had spirit but little natural wealth or world power. Now we have both wealth and idealism. In the story, the husband made up of principal parts at length lost all his vitality. Finally he had neither physical virility nor spiritual charm. Will this happen to the United States?

Well, read *The Magic Mountain* and the Joseph novels and make up your mind. Ask the question again, Will the United States lose all that it has gained because of apathy and then end up with Facism and bankruptcy, just another false start attending man's effort to unite beauty and its powers with spirit? Certainly Thomas Mann would venture no answer, for he knows the value of the musical prolonged note, the teasing melancholy of the not-yet, the ironic and artistic principle of reserve.

Quest or Conquest?

RALPH W. SOCKMAN

LIFE is both a quest and a conquest. The measure of its achievement depends both on the area explored and on the areas mastered. To live complacently within one's little garden of smugness, undisturbed by the voice which calls "beyond the ranges" is to miss the "life which is life indeed." On the other hand, to live amid perpetual question marks without any periods, to dwell in halfway houses with no glimpse of satisfying goals—such living may give one a haunting assurance of going somewhere but it leaves a tormenting feeling of not arriving.

In the offerings of current fiction are many books which prod the mind out of its smug provincialism. War is unsettling. As General Smuts said at the close of World War I, humanity has struck its tents and is on the march. But whither? Fox holes are not furrows in which satisfying life philosophies are sown and cultivated. The most widely read novels of the moment are provocative, not assuring or comforting.

A novel written by a successful playwright won the Harper competition as the Prize Novel of 1943-44. Martin Flavin in *Journey in the Dark* launches a small-town lad out into the turbulent currents of America's big business and at last into the maelstrom of two world wars.

The story begins with the arrival of the penniless Braden family at Wyattville, a sleepy settlement on the Iowa side of the Mississippi River. The young wife was a girl of excellent family and fine personal qualities, married to a good-looking but stupid and shiftless man. In those days people were not allowed to starve; and so Braden was made town marshal, given a run-down house to live in, and a salary of \$20 per month. It was the wife's industrious skill with the needle which supplemented this income into a subsistence livelihood.

Of the family's four children, Sam, the youngest, was the only one who shared both the quality of his mother and the surface attractiveness of his worthless father. The town's leading family was the Wyatts, for whom it was named. One son of the original Wyatt became the town's banker and local financial magnate. His brother, Elliott Wyatt, founded a great banking investment firm, with its seat in New York. Much of Sam's personal woes, as a child and in earlier manhood, came from his

secret love for Eileen Wyatt—whom he one day married, after a fashion—and his jealousy of her preferred cousin, Neill Wyatt. The townspeople were democratic, but Sam, as a child, keenly felt the chill of poverty. He was ambitious to improve his position and help care for the family when his mother died.

Persistence, self-denial, business honesty, a gift for salesmanship, good judgment and that intangible element termed "luck," brought Sam slowly but surely to business success. Ultimately he became owner of a highly prosperous wallpaper mill in Chicago, and its earning capacity attracted the attention of Elliott Wyatt as a proper subject for financial promotion. In the spring of 1929 the stocks and securities had all been sold—and Sam found himself entirely free of business for the first time, and owner of five million dollars in cash. This money was put into government bonds, not because he foresaw the crash that came in August, for he did not. For him business had become a futile journey in the dark.

Meanwhile his disappointing marriage with Eileen had ended in divorce, and a second marriage had endowed him with a son, Hath. Some years were spent in Europe, with Hath attending Swiss and German schools. Unconsciously culture was being absorbed by Sam. Later a two-thousand-acre place was acquired on the river's bank at Wyattville, and turned into an estate of richness and beauty. But Hath grew up and married against his father's will. Sam's wife died, leaving him alone. The Second World War came and Hath died in combat, as a flyer. Sam's big house burned down, unmourned. His land was taken, at a satisfactory price, for a war plant. His own family is all but extinct. The money remained, but all else was gone. It was a journey in the dark.

Flavin does not help much with this ending. He strips away the oldtime glamor from the "home-town boy who makes good" in a worldly way. His exposure of the shallow and often shoddy sources of personal success are cynical rather than sensational. Gallantry and honor are found deeply blended with hardness and callous self-interest. Colorful as the picture is, it does indict the epoch that has gone, while offering little light as to the future. It leaves us still journeying in the dark.

In *Peter Domanig*, Morning in Vienna, Victor White takes us deeply into the heart of a sensitively courageous lad, and into the spirit of one of the world's most glamorous cities. The book is another journey in the dark but more light is allowed to break. Sweetness and strength, tragedy and triumph, give this work the earmarks of greatness, and redeem the

sometimes brutal frankness of its narrative with a delicacy, a beauty and a sense of developing worth, which give the lift of encouragement to hearts made heavy with literary pessimism.

A few years before the First World War, the story begins with Peter giving wing to childhood's rich imagination, in a crowded little apartment, while waiting for a gruff and unlovely "father" to awaken from his afternoon nap. Interwoven with the child's own thoughts is the pattern of his unhappy background. His own mother has gone to America, and there has a husband and two younger children. Gradually he discovers that he is illegitimate. He lives with his mother's sister and is bound with ties of affection to his older cousins, but regarded by the adults as a grudgingly accepted responsibility.

People in many walks of Viennese life touch shoulders with Peter as he grows older. Shadowed by poverty, family oppression and uneasiness about his own dimly understood status, he nevertheless finds many windows opening out into a world of culture and position. His Cousin Franz had taken degrees at the university, and with a rare gift of personal charm, had established lasting contacts with important people. Peter himself had a voice, and it led him into the charmed circle of choir instruction under Herr Granini, musical leader of the metropolis; only to be plucked out again by forces he could not control. He had a talent, inherited from the artist who had been his father; but a rebellious inferiority complex rebuffed the art teacher who offered free instruction. His heart set on getting into a military academy, with its fine social contacts, he puts forth a tremendous effort, and passes all the tests, but he is rejected in the end because of his illegitimate birth.

The war of 1914 breaks and bites ever more sharply into the Viennese pattern of life. Peter passes safely through a perilous period which almost engulfs him in a life of crime, and then becomes an apprentice in a wholesale hardware firm. There his inferiority complex acts as a goad. It drives him into extraordinary effort and toil, but tinges his attitude with a bitterness which makes him a ready victim for imposition at the hands of immediate superiors. In the end he wins the confidence of his employer and financial competence, but not until the plastic of his youth had been hardened in a forge that knew no softness.

Frustration might so easily have gotten Peter down. Invitingly opened and briefly explored were the anterooms to crime, to Communism and to self-indulgence. Fortunately his life had not been entirely drab.

Through the avenues of his own talents, and those of Cousin Franz, he had come to see this city of music and light and culture from many angles.

When the war was over, and while Austria's economic future was being made over at Versailles, Herr Granini sadly remarks: "It takes a thousand years to make a city like Vienna and the culture that goes with it. A thousand years of prosperity and security, and the presence of a hundred special factors nobody has ever analyzed. . . . Economics alone can't explain a city like Vienna or Paris. Nor being the seat of a court; Berlin has had a court for a good many hundreds of years, but Berlin is still an upstart culturally. . . . The growth of a city like ours is as unaccountable as the growth of an especially fine blossom on a quite ordinary bush—and as rare."

The atmosphere of Vienna lives between the covers of this book. It is not described. It is not idealized. It is not actually pictured. Somehow the author does more than that. He clothes each of a multitude of characters with the aura of individuality. We mingle with them. They move under their own power. And we move with them. Forgetful of our own times and our own land, as the author's words weave their magic carpet in our minds, we ourselves become interwoven into this moving drama of the old and the transitional Vienna. And underlying the author's unflinching realism can be felt the throbbing pulse of a hopeful vitality which survives and develops amid the shadows.

Somerset Maugham affixes a subtitle to *The Razor's Edge*. It is "The Story of a Man Who Found a Faith." But the sophisticated Maugham is far better at puncturing the foibles and falsities of his contemporaries than in supplying them with a satisfying faith. His most deft work is done not on his central character who is seeking a faith but on Elliott Templeton, an elderly American who manages to navigate the social seas of Europe without any spiritual compass or guiding star save an eye to fashion and the furtherance of his own ego.

Larry Darnell, the hero of the story, served with distinction as an under-age member of the air force in World War I. He comes back to Chicago and to his friends. He is in love with Elliott Templeton's niece, and she with him. But money and the making of it hold no appeal for him. In the air force, death had seemed too final to permit life to be devoted to meaningless pursuits. So Larry went his own way—alone—with first stop in Paris. Measured by the standards of his Chicago social set, he was an enigma—and a failure.

The background for most of the action in this narrative is Paris, the Rhine valley, the Riviera and Larry's five-year stay among the Yogi of India; a background which glows with the intimate knowledge and affection of the author. Beginning soon after the close of World War I, and stretching down to the latter part of the 1930's, it covers a period of time that is poignant with the changes then sweeping away the old and ushering in the new, changes which waited not upon the will of an unsuspecting world. Among minor characters are some whose realism is nonetheless pitiful and appealing because unabashedly unmoral.

The author, however, is not content with creating a stirring tale, and nothing more. An intensely religious man who finds it hard to believe in God, Larry after many researches of his own, accepts the invitation of a monk to expose himself to the atmosphere of an Alsatian monastery. Deeply impressed by the ritual and the sincerity of his hosts, he nevertheless finds it difficult to believe that God could expect or desire so surging a chorus of constant praise, for even a high-grade human being finds himself embarrassed and distressed if his friends glorify his deeds constantly to his face. Nor can he accept the idea that God requires His children to pray daily for the very bread they eat; because, said he, even human fathers feed their children as a mere matter of course, out of their own love and sense of duty. Even less could he believe in eternal punishment for committing sins, when proneness to sin has been implanted in human hearts by the punishing power, or with His consent. So he went to India for further light.

To explain the Vedanta teachings which Larry finally embraced, after five years among the Yogi, is impossible, of course, in a review; but his acceptance of them is made highly plausible in the narrative. Larry was attracted to this austere faith because, he believed, it did not condition salvation on the exercise of belief. "It asks," he said, "only that you have a passionate craving to know Reality." Love and good works are accepted as means to salvation, but "the noblest way, though the hardest, is the way of knowledge, for its instrument is the most precious faculty of man, his reason" (p. 294).

The story of Larry ends with his telling the author of his self-imposed poverty and imminent departure. Like Spinoza, who ground lenses for a living, he was expecting to toil humbly as might be needed for his abstemious mode of living, with freedom otherwise to pursue his goal. The only evangelism he had in mind was such as might come indirectly through the force of his own example.

And there is an evangelizing power resident in the personality and experience of Larry. Against the background of the conventional religion and the contemporary figures depicted in the book, the spirit of Larry sheds an appealing radiance. He shows up the futility of our American activism and the emptiness of our materialism. But Larry is hardly a modern Saint Augustine. He lacks force and conclusiveness. We feel that for himself his journey through the dark has led to a dawn but he seems a pilgrim rather than a pioneer. In *The Razor's Edge* Somerset Maugham is far below the heights he reached in *Of Human Bondage*. Satire is a stimulant but hardly a cure for the ills of the soul.

Rex Warner has allowed his imagination to take a flight into the land of journey's end. In *Return of the Traveller* he poses the question, not "Why do I live?" but "Why did I die?" He personalizes a soldier who has been killed in battle and who now ponders the various sight-seers coming to visit his tomb. In their words and attitudes, the spirit of "the unknown soldier" seeks an explanation of the reason for his death.

In the company of visitors was a good cross-section of humankind. There was Sir Alfred Fothey, distinguished scion of a wealthy family, who had lost a brother and a son in war. There was Bob Clark, skilled munitions worker, who was young, cocky, self-satisfied and rather pleased with a war which brought him both safety and high pay. There, too, was an Aryan refugee scholar from Germany whose own son had betrayed him to the Nazis. There was a soldier returned from the Spanish Republican Army. Finally, there was the tragic-looking woman in black—her husband dead in World War I, her son in World War II.

Divergent in every other respect, their views had one quality in common. They neither offered nor carried conviction. Sir Alfred had little to offer save references to traditional British loyalty. Clark impatiently asserted that no one knew what it was all about. The refugee scholar movingly asserted that the soldier died worthily to defend "Culture, civilization, the progress. . . . He is dead to resist the evil idea." But this the Spanish Army zealot vehemently denied. Modern civilization, he thought, has nothing worthy of defense. If this dead man is to have any value through his death, "it is we who must give it to him," by creating a more just and kindly world. But the woman in black thought the whole body of mankind is at fault. "All we want is love, a home, children, security . . . (but) what are considered most sacred feelings of duty and loyalty will help to do away with them. . . . This soldier . . . I would tell him that he died for the sins

of the whole world." Into significant episodes of these sight-seers' lives the soldier's spirit is taken as an unseen witness. Probe as he may, however, he finds no more than a mere foreshadowing of the thoughts each had spoken in the cathedral. Psychologically the episodes are satisfying. But they leave no substantial light in reply to the soldier's question. Perplexity and bewilderment are merely added to the confusion that obsessed him at the start.

Finding himself back in the cathedral again, he begins to wonder. Why should anyone choose to live, where those who value life most are most inevitably disappointed? Is not war itself, perhaps, a gigantic attempt "at liberation by suicide from insupportable conditions"? He wants to find a significance in living, a belief that "peace was what the living desired." There seems to be "a set of the will against the beauty and the excitement and the tranquillity which he had seen too late."

It is not easy to interpret the discussion that follows between the soldier's spirit and the priest who serves as guide to the sight-seers. Man's very fondness for building monuments to his achievements in the co-operative activities of war is evidence of aspiration to common effort for the common good. Beginning with the clan, these organizational units have been constantly increasing in size, and man's vision of a duty to his fellows has reached constantly growing horizons. But his imagination is too weak as yet to embrace mankind as a whole.

Indeed, some of the political units are greater than the reach of vision of those who dwell within them. With regard to the organization of the world's economic resources "you might think that every sane person would wish to see this done so as to secure the maximum benefit to everyone, but even within a country 'separate groups will fight against each other.'" The only solution, thinks the priest, lies in the assumption that "each man's life is equally valuable and equally to be respected." For such an assumption there is only one basis, "the belief in God."

War, the author seems to say, is the fruit of an imperfect good; the willingness of men to sacrifice their lives for others, limited by inability to perceive the common qualities and common interests which should bind mankind together in peace. There are evils of peace as well as of war, and of these the world should be cleansed. War itself, the horrible harvest of myopic minds, is unlikely to end until all men's eyes are opened to the unique worth of the individual, who alone is capable of life and of death.

In such a conclusion there is challenge, but very little present comfort. It is a challenge, because the opening of men's eyes in this way can be set up as a goal for men of good will. But it is short on present comfort, for the reaching of such a goal must be attained through the regeneration of myopic men in such lands as Germany and Japan. For those who put their expectations of peace in mere political organization, Warner's thesis has little consolation. The only gain the author appears to see, from death in war, lies in the hope that it may help to end war by opening wider the eyes of the world to the unique quality and dignity of each human life.

Rex Warner is a master of English prose. There are luminous passages hardly to be surpassed in contemporary literature. The author is more successful in raising his questions than in imparting reality to his characters. However, if his characters lack living reality, his questions most certainly do not.

Perhaps even a most sketchy survey of the quarter's fiction would be expected to mention Joseph Stanley Pennell's, *The History of Rome Hanks*. Here is great talent spent on an ever-fertile field, the War between the States. Perhaps never has the waste of war been portrayed more powerfully. The realistic vividness of battlefields, the chicanery of calculating politicians and officers, the fidelity and heroism of loyal soldiers, the excruciating anguish of amputations and prison camps—all these elements furnish the material of a huge primitive painting.

But alas, the picture is marred by such inexcusable vulgarity and obscenity that a review will not be attempted here lest it seem to carry even in part the reviewer's endorsement as worth-while reading.

Journey in the Dark. BY MARTIN FLAVIN. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944. pp. 432. \$2.75.

Peter Domanig. BY VICTOR WHITE. New York: Bobbs Merrill Company, 1944. pp. 704. \$3.00.

The Razor's Edge. BY W. SOMERSET MAUGHAM. Garden City: Doubleday Doran and Company, Inc., 1944. pp. 343. \$2.75.

Return of the Traveller. BY REX WARNER. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1944. pp. 209. \$2.00.

The History of Rome Hanks. BY JOSEPH STANLEY PENNELL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944. pp. 363. \$2.75.

Book Reviews

Lands Away. BY EARL MARLATT. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944.
pp. 179. \$1.50.

Poets have always been "the music makers" and "the dreamers of dreams," but they have been, as well, "the movers and shakers of the world." It is that fact which Dr. Earl Marlatt has taken as thesis for his erudite, provocative and inspiring little book, *Lands Away*, and with it he has blazed a path across some of the uncharted reaches of our living, giving direction to thought and sustenance for the spirit. For those who wonder whether mankind has come to the edge of total darkness with nothing but night beyond, he offers, not as definitive answer, but as recorded experience, what others have gleaned from far voyages through Keats's "realms of gold."

His volume is a personal log book of what he himself has observed in those "lands away" of which Emily Dickinson spoke and which are to be reached through the books which hold the accumulated wisdom of those whose vision of the immediate lengthens the perspective of more distant horizons.

Books are the transports which can and will lead us to those places where "the stars still sing." The poetry of yesterday has often embodied the philosophy of today, and through its ideals determined the politics of tomorrow. "It has," says the author, "a bright livingness which makes men remember and makes this remembrance a polestar in the perilous night." The soul-force as a part of all great literature is the yeast which works through all the strata of our civilization.

Remember the light invoked by Harriett Beecher Stowe in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and the social crusade against the exploitation of children waged through the novels of Dickens. In 1842 Tennyson looked toward a far future when he heard:

"the world-wide whisper of the south-wind rushing warm
With the standards of the peoples plunging through the thunder storm;
Till the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furled
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the World."

And more recently Ignazio Silone, great Italian novelist, spoke, even while his country was being bound to the chariot wheels of Hitler, of "The Seed Beneath the Snow," which was sprouting and would eventually come to leaf, flower and fruitage when the shepherds and vintners in the hills united with the downtrodden men in the valleys "to choose Jesus rather than Barabbas." His poetry of yesterday has become the philosophy of today and the politics of tomorrow, for the seed has already burst the icy confines of Fascist domination and such returning refugees as Benedetto Croce and Carlo Sforza will lead their people from tyranny into light.

Book after book is brought into focus, for Doctor Marlatt has been prodigal in his illustrations, drawing from poetry and prose, both new and old, with telling effect. At times, too, he has introduced some of his own luminous work. He has found in the masters the common denominator of all living and presented it with a richness of anecdote that is completely rewarding. That common denominator is the soul of man, which transcends the darkness of selfishness and greed and reaches toward the stars. It is the alpha and omega which determines the set of the individual's sails and the direction of a world.

Catherine Breshkovsky, called "the Lincoln of the Russian Emancipation," who spent fifty-two of her eighty-odd years in prison, recognized that fact when she said, "It is not for one country or one people alone that we work. Always remember . . . that the most beautiful thing in the world is a human soul."

Through literature we can make our voyages of discovery to many lands away. In it you will find that the fragments of the ages fall into a pattern which is eternal, for the star of faith rides high in the skies of night and all the darkness in the world cannot dim its lustre. In the poetry of the world "His truth goes marching on."

ALICE DIXON BOND

Literary Editor, *The Boston Herald*, Boston, Massachusetts.

Peace Is the Victory. Edited by HARROP A. FREEMAN. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944. pp. x-253. \$1.50.

Peace Is the Victory is a symposium in which thirteen well-known Americans share. We must assume that all of them are *technically* pacifists, for the editor in his preface states that "from no other source may the reader obtain a similar cross section of pacifist thought brought to bear upon the problems which beset our generation." What is a pacifist, and how does he differ from a Christian non-pacifist as he seeks a better world order? The answer to this question is not to be found in this extremely interesting and valuable book if you except the opening absolutist statement of John Haynes Holmes, which does not seem to this reviewer to be a proper lead chapter for what follows. Page discusses, "What Causes War"; Muste, "The Historical Inspiration of Civilization"; Palmer, "How to Plan for Peace"; Pickett, "They Cry for Help"; Freeman, "A New International Law"; Paullin, "A New International Order"; Willard, Jones and Allen, the geographical areas of Europe, Asia and Latin America in which justice and good will must be achieved. Any one of these chapters could have been written by a Christian non-pacifist. To say this does not detract from their value, only emphasizes the fact that all men of good will readily support the chief theses of *Peace Is the Victory*.

There is so much excellent and stimulating writing in this symposium that it seems invidious to select chapters for special mention. However, by doing so the quality and direction of the book may be suggested.

Doctor Fosdick's chapter: "World Co-operation—A Political Must" is a basic, powerful statement of the folly of isolationism, which is "ethically monstrous and economically insane"—"and, in the end, utterly impossible." Nevertheless, while "a dead issue in theory, it may easily prove to be far from a dead issue in the emotions of our people." After a lucid discussion of the chief plans being offered for world co-operation, Fosdick warns against a "perfectionist" attitude which refuses to accept measures unless they are ideal. "We (pacifists) have no right to be negative or individualistic, merely savers of our Souls, or anarchists toward government's difficult struggle with the ethical and political compromises that creating any world organization will involve. We, too, shall have to go as far as we can go, accepting compromises that we deeply disapprove, if we are convinced that the main direction is right." "One thing, however, we who are pacifists can not be, and that is isolationist."

Another chapter worth the price of the book is by Hiram Motherwell, formerly foreign correspondent for the *Chicago Daily News* and now a member of the

Postwar Research Council of Columbia Broadcasting System. He discusses "The Substance of Reconstruction" with the illuminating subheads: "the anatomy of disaster"; "tasks of reconstruction"; "instrumentalities of reconstruction"; "how much force will be needed." His central contention is that "the real problem is that of consent." "Force, which I believe is playing the negative role in our time of temporarily protecting free peoples from being deprived of their own power to give consent, is utterly unable to make people *want* to do things. A free society must be built on something more durable than gunpowder."

Motherwell then discusses "organic agencies of reconstruction" such as co-operative societies, trade unions, church parishes, and the underground. He closes his chapter with a fine statement on "The Science of Consent," which has within it "the dynamics of self-perpetuation."

All of the writers agree that the task ahead involves much more than political or social machinery. They seek "association and establishment of community at the supra-national level." This is fundamentally a spiritual problem dependent on the creative beliefs which are the core of all high religion and likewise dependent on consistent human behavior. World community, Muste reminds us, is a matter of human beings living together in certain relationships and "the quality of human beings is therefore an inescapable element in every social equation"—which is another way of saying that economic, social, and political regeneration are bound up into individual regeneration. Men

"Constantly try to escape
From the darkness outside and within
By dreaming of systems so perfect
that no one will need to be good." (T. S. Eliot)

We are, therefore, challenged to press the claims of intelligent personal and social evangelism as the way to a just and durable peace.

JAMES C. BAKER

Bishop, California Area, The Methodist Church, Los Angeles, California.

The Challenge of Israel's Faith. By G. ERNEST WRIGHT. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1944. pp. ix-108. \$1.50.

The concern of this interesting and important volume is, in the words of the author, "not with the history of Israelite religion, but rather with the central propositions of Israelite faith." It is an inspired work and is valuable as a basis for further inquiry by all students of the Bible and religion, although it seems to be directed mainly to a Christian audience.

The author endeavors to show that the Old Testament has essential contributions to make to the thinking and life of the Christian people; and that one cannot study the New Testament properly without discovering its deep roots in the Old Testament. To prove this thesis, Professor Wright cites the case of Martin Luther, who, "turning to the Bible, found that for which he had been looking; the Scripture at once became the source of new life and new light. He went to the Bible for help and found it a never-ending source of living water" (p. 11). The author, furthermore, finds that there are three primary themes running through the Old Testament, which the Christian preacher should keep in mind. They are:

God, human sin, and redemption. It occurs to the reviewer that there are many more that might be added. But no one will disagree with the author's main thesis regarding the mission of the Jewish prophets, that there were men "who were absorbed in the issues of their time, analyzing them with the acute awareness of a divine mission," and that they were certainly not interested in merely platitudes, or theological theorizing. "Rather they were radical, religious revolutionaries, steeped in the knowledge of the God of their fathers, focusing the great sum of that knowledge upon the political and economic crisis of the age" (p. 28).

Professor Wright has said (pp. 30ff) that in the Old Testament there is little history for history's sake, but a religious interpretation of history in which there is a continuing encounter between God and man. This statement should be somewhat modified, for in the Old Testament there is a religious interpretation, not of the history of mankind, but rather that of the people of Israel. The early chapters of Genesis, dealing apparently with the history of the human race, are merely introductory in character, leading to the story of the people of Israel, as told in the concluding chapters of Genesis, and the books which follow.

Throughout the fourth chapter of his book, Professor Wright, in a somewhat apologetic tone, draws attention to the fact that the term "love" is used only occasionally in the Old Testament. Instead, he claims, the term "grace" is found rather frequently. But these two terms "love" and "grace" when applied to God "mean precisely the same thing." In support of his thesis that all of the New Testament is *not* new but more often based in the teachings of the Old Testament, the author could have dwelt, more than casually, upon the fact that the Golden Rule, sometimes attributed to Jesus as the first one who pronounced it, is found in the Old Testament (Leviticus 19:18). He does, however, indicate that "Scripture of Jesus was the Old Testament. He revered it, studied it and frequently quoted from it" (p. 9). In one place, Professor Wright discussed the Golden Rule as interpreted by Jesus (p. 10): "He could present the Golden Rule and say: 'This is the law and the prophets' (Matt. 7:12). The first and greatest commandments, said he, are: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God—and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets' (Matt. 22:40)." It is interesting to note that this very interpretation of the Golden Rule was given by Rabbi Akiba (135 C.E.) (Midrash Genesis Rabbah, end of ch. 24). The question obviously arises: who borrowed from whom?

In conclusion it should be said that the volume is definitely a unique and excellent contribution to biblical literature and should be in the hands of ministers, teachers and all those who strive to realize man's humanity to man. It is very useful as a guide in the study and appreciation of the Old Testament. "The misuse and misuse of the Old Testament," says Professor Wright, "is a matter for concern but not despair. If, indeed, God has spoken through the history of Israel, then, surely His Word will be confirmed in our time or that of our children. 'The same Spirit who spake by the mouths of the prophets,' may indeed penetrate our hearts and convince us, while disturbing the fixity of our fashions of thought."

The author's lucid style convincingly expresses the propositions concerning Israel's faith. An interested reader is more than apt to learn that the challenge of Israel's faith is in the challenge of faith itself.

RABBI SAMUEL M. SEGAL

Mount Neboh Congregation, New York, New York.

The Crisis of Faith. By STANLEY ROMAINE HOPPER. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944. pp. 328. \$2.75.

This book is the winner, among some four hundred entries, of a prize contest, sponsored in 1943 by the Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, for the best religious book manuscript by a new writer. Doctor Hopper has already to his credit an unusual educational background. He has degrees from the University of Southern California and Boston University. He has studied at Harvard, the University of Zurich, sat under famous teachers at Paris and Oxford. His book reflects his rich and varied intellectual discipline. It is an astounding *tour de force*. One feels in reading it much like Keats, watcher of the skies, who saw a new planet swim into his ken. The brilliance of its style, the opulent philosophic and literary sources upon which it draws, the sweep of its generalizations and the penetration of its insights, all combine to give it unusual and prophetic distinction—and make it an extraordinarily difficult book to review.

It begins and almost ends with a quotation from Léon Bloy: "Modern man has been brought to bay at the extremity of all things," and with this as a thesis it traces, analyzes and judges what has brought him to this extremity. Also it summarizes his so far futile attempts to find an escape and indicates the answers of Christian faith to the travail of his mind and spirit, and the debacles of his cultures and his civilization. For our crisis is a crisis in faith and has no solution, save in the reaffirmation of a Christian faith. We are at the midnight hour when each man must unmask (from first to last the author makes his shadows deep and unrelieved). Midnight hour is crisis hour, which means that the fate from which we fled has overtaken us. The drama of existence is being played between fate and destiny, between "our fatal heritage and our heritage of faith"; our only hope lies in a vital renewal, to repeat, of our heritage of faith.

Our fatal inheritance is the bequest of the Renaissance which dissolved the old bases of faith and the disciplines of old culture and supplied nothing to take their place. It supplanted instead the "myth" of indefinite progress, the fallacy of the natural goodness of man, a misleading belief in his ability to do anything he wanted to do; and sin faded out of the picture. Result: an indefensible optimism, a deceptive trust in human reason and a deal of action that got us nowhere. Meanwhile the deepening shadows are reflected in the literature of dissolution and despair, great and inclusive philosophies, and a culture too thin to stand. Both thought and culture become experimental. All this Doctor Hopper traces with an acuteness of analysis and a wealth of illustration impossible here either to indicate or condense.

He examines and evaluates the philosophies of the last two hundred years almost in successive sections. In the next part of the book, after a fascinating *jeu d'esprit* with "Alice in Wonderland," "The White Knight," "Tweedle-de-dum and Tweedle-de-de," and "Humpty-Dumpty," as the basis for a philosophy of history, the author opposes to all which he has examined and dismissed, a Christian standpoint.

That standpoint denies the adequacy of the unilluminated reason, it reaffirms "sin" as a tragic dislocation between man's will and God's will, "a delusion of self-sufficiency willfully persisted in." It enthrones a transcendent and personal God to whom we are responsible and "grounds itself" in an event; the historical incarnation of Christ and the supreme significance of the cross. All this is enabled in the individual life by its acceptance through faith which is "*an act*, a total act, an act

of the person-in-decision." (All this is elaborated at length.) The Christian standpoint has its own proper humanism, its "Socratic" self-examination in which Jesus Christ supplies the norm of our knowledge of ourselves, and real personalism. For it is only through our knowledge of God that we know ourselves as persons. And all this looks up upon the cross, which is at once personal and historical. "By it a man may found himself upon another person, upon a person in history, who is nevertheless a Person of eternal significance." This relationship can be established through faith alone, for "faith is a release from self-sufficiency."

A review like this, in view of the contents of the book, is like flying over a continental mass. It hardly indicates the contours beneath the plane, let alone what clothes them. An adequate examination of the author's positions and conclusions would grow into another book. His very index is awesome. The authorities most often cited begin to grow familiar to readers of contemporary theology: Augustine, Berdyaev, Brunner, Kierkegaard, Maritain, Nietzsche and Niebuhr, and over and over and over again Pascal. These have become the elect voices for the theologies of crisis and in a loose way, leaving out Nietzsche, the evangelists of the neo-orthodoxy.

The book suffers from its opulence and brilliance. Doctor Hopper will eventually write more "leanly" after more experience in teaching his ruling ideas to theological students. It is excessively technical in its theological and philosophical vocabulary. Perhaps if all that is here said in the 316 pages is so essential to our salvation, it might be more simply said. But these qualities are the overplus of a richly charged mind, finding its first ample literary expression. We shall learn from the author again, and meanwhile he has established himself arrestingly in the foremost group of the younger contemporary American theological writers.

GAIVS GLENN ATKINS

North Marshfield, Massachusetts.

For We Have This Treasure. By PAUL SCHERER. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944. pp. xii-212. \$2.00.

He is a brave soul who undertakes to produce a new book on the old art of preaching. Indeed, one wonders after listening to many lectures on homiletics and adventuring here and there among the pews whether, after all, it is an art that can be taught. Unless a man has the divine afflatus for speaking to congregations of his fellows there is probably little that any teacher or writer can tell him which will make of him a flaming prophet if he be, by nature, a boor.

During seventy years, however, the Lyman Beecher lectureship on preaching at Yale University has set the American standard for instruction in the art, method, and message of the Christian pulpit, and the gifted minister of Holy Trinity Lutheran Church of New York City stands in this volume in the succession of the most brilliant lecturers of American Protestantism. He confesses that he has not attempted to say anything new or original. But he has, with distinguished art, set forth essentials and assumptions upon the basis of which any good minister of Christ must set forth if he is true to his Christian heritage and calling.

This reviewer found himself measuring his call to preach by every page of Doctor Scherer's brilliant book. Perhaps it was an inconspicuous sentence tucked into the very first chapter that did it—"He cannot go on with any peace or with any power if he questions long the very fact of his own vocation." Surely!

If there are any questions in the preacher's mind concerning his message, or his right to deliver it, the congregation is certain to discover them whether he voices them or not. Every sermon which truly pleads a cause has in it the elements of a holy dogmatism—*this thing I know*. And the minister of Holy Trinity insists that every sermon must do more than state a case; it must plead a cause. The loss of this passion explains the impotency of many Protestant pulpits today.

The preacher who really reads this stinging and stimulating volume must be prepared to be brave and honest. It will mirror his soul as well as his style. Epigrammatic, New Testament centered, mystical and yet with the smell of the earth upon it, it is the fine fruitage of a devout and dedicated mind.

ROY L. SMITH

Editor, *The Christian Advocate*, Chicago, Illinois.

Christianity and Democracy. By JACQUES MARITAIN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. pp. 98. \$1.25.

First appearing, in French, in the spring of 1943, but prefaced for its English translation in October, and finally available to English readers in May, 1944, this little book addresses itself to the cultivation of a hope that victory "will open up an era of constructive work dedicated to the true enfranchisement of human life." By the summer of 1942, when the essay was written, the author was no longer anxious about the military outcome, and had already begun to turn his attention to the winning of the peace. He hopes for an "heroic renewal," when victory shall have unlocked the gates of history and opened the way. The hope is delicately poised, and will not be realized unless the free peoples "understand the meaning of the trial in which they are engaged" and will "purify their actions and their thoughts, their philosophy of life and their political philosophy." Victory will give civilization time for heroic action; democracy and the gospel, reconciled and the sole armor of postwar man, are the best hope of earth, and the greatest promise, if not of heaven, at least of the heavenly direction.

The First World War marked the end of an age—the end of the "modern world." A pagan empire has sought to deal a mortal blow to the old democracy, tottering under the external blows of totalitarian enslavers and under the internal fevers of error, denial of its gospel roots, and general lack of self-confidence. The crucial question is whether, having militarily wiped out Fascism and Nazism, civilization will escape being morally conquered by their substitutes. Among the culprits who have disfigured the fair flower of Western culture—democracy imbued with Christianity—are listed Machiavelli (who regarded unjust force as the essence of politics), Luther (whose scission unbalanced the modern world by withdrawing Germany from the European community), Descartes and the Encyclopedists (who swept the world into an illusory optimism), Rousseau and Kant (who "dressed democratic thought up in their sentimental and philosophical formulas"), and Hegel (whose pantheism taught the modern world to deify its own historical movement).

A chapter on the evangelical inspiration of the secular conscience claims seven noteworthy gains of the gospel at work in democratic history. The democratic ideal stems from Christian evangelism, and will grow only with this as its true essence. This new democracy of our hopes bets on heroism. A powerful religious renewal, "an increment of soul," a work of recovery and purification, is in the offing, if, with hope as a weapon, we can keep civilization from veering to

barbarism as it goes through its "process of *disintoxication*." The closing pages wax almost poetic in eulogy of "the man of common humanity." The spirit of "an heroic humanism" and evangelical love even wells up in the solution of the communist problem by staking everything on love and generosity.

This is an excellent little book. It is a bit frowsy on the causes of the war; has perhaps a somewhat limiting French and Catholic perspective; seems too readily to see what it hopes for, perhaps, in speaking of "the flame of idealism" with which the soldiers face death; and fails to avoid self-contradiction in its discussion of the way Christianity and democracy are linked: a Christian may achieve his salvation "while defending a political philosophy other than the democratic," yet "the energies of the gospel must pass into temporal life" and "there are in the message of the gospel political and social implications which must at all cost be unfurled in history." "Must" is a strong word.

The Catholic "ceiling" to the book is by no means generally oppressive, but sometimes crowds down upon the spirit of the reader with distressing effect. In writing of the powerful religious renewal in preparation, "which . . . will restore to their vital sources all the persecuted, all the believers of the great Judeo-Christian family, not only the faithful of the Catholic Church and those of the Protestant churches, but also those of Judaism," the edge is taken from the lofty sentiment by the conclusion respecting the Jews. Their "abandonment to nameless suffering and iniquity, and to the sword of vile exterminators would be an unbearable scandal for the soul if we did not see in it a terrible reminder of the promises of their God."

The book likewise commits the prevalent fallacy of praising the gospel but trusting the ammunition. When the military victory is won we shall fully open our ears to the gospel, even in relations with communists. But, of course, that will not work with the Nazis. "Everything must be staked on hatred, or cowardice, or love." But let us wait awhile before we stake *everything* on love with the Nazis. . . . And so the book has a "tomorrowness" about it which has eaten the heart out of democracy and the gospel this long time. The book was written before Churchill took the ideological aims out of the war; one wonders how the author's precarious hope is faring, now that the friends of religion and democracy generally are adjusting themselves to the prospects of a power peace. The book seems, in the end, the two years old that it is, but has the meat of democracy and Christianity for every "today." One hopes it will convince its author.

PAUL A. REYNOLDS

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

The Listening Post. By THOMAS B. MORGAN. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1944. pp. 242. \$3.00.

The saying that on occasion newspaper writers encounter stories that are better than fiction is aptly illustrated by the author of *The Listening Post*. In his university days young Morgan cub-reported, after graduation did the police courts, then left the "crime beat" for the "sublime beat" covering such matters as ministerial gatherings and church happenings. While reporting the Rev. Billy Sunday's big revival in Pittsburgh he came within a shaving's breadth of following his fellow reporters down the sawdust trail. When the United States joined the Allies in 1917 he was catapulted to France, attached to the 28th Division. There he did war

news for the Associated Press. The war over, A.P.'s Melville E. Stone pointed a long finger at him and said, "Rome!" So for the next eighteen eventful years correspondent Morgan became an auditor at the world's most famous listening post.

On Vatican Hill Mr. Morgan's duty was to keep his eyes open. To see all and note all. His look was both microscopic and telescopic. Possessed with the power to make others see what he saw, he has made his book, though without cuts, a highly illustrated volume. Some of his scenes are candid camera shots, brief photo-biographies; others more closely resemble pencil drawings or pen sketches, others in their grandeur and finesse are like works of the great painters in oil, and still others are like motion pictures in color and with sound track. These are not masques in a pageant, but people of flesh and blood who live and move, pray and fight, joke and plot. We see Pius XI at eighty-two lashing out at Mussolini almost with his last breath; the youthful and aspiring Pro-Secretary Merry Del Val robing the new pope, taking off the red cap of Cardinal Del Sarto and replacing it with the white zucchetto of Pius XI; we get a heroic view of tall, stately, purple robed Eugenio Pacelli pausing half way down the broad stairway of his Munich palace making the sign of the cross while below him stand five ruffians with raised muskets. Morgan is particularly talented in describing a scene like the coronation of Pius XII. Through the packed Cathedral of St. Peter moves the stately procession of 2,000 papal gendarmes in eighteenth century tunics and white trousers stuffed into tall boots, Swiss guards with shining armor, religious orders in more somber garb, bishops resplendent in miter and alb, cardinals in white and gold over scarlet, then gaudily arrayed ushers bearing aloft the supreme pontiff himself wearing the triple tiara, his shoulders draped with cloth of gold buckled at the throat with precious gems. Then the final scene on the balcony facing the great square when the pontiff fully crowned raised his hand and with the sign of the cross spoke his benediction of peace *urbi et orbi*.

Mr. Morgan's chief task was to keep his ears open. To hear all. To listen to the gossip of simple priests, and the double-talk of foreign ambassadors; to hear the pontifications of the princes of the Church, and the raucous mouthings of the swashbuckling dictators and their stooges; to catch the dropped words of scowling storm troopers bivouacked in the square of St. Peter's as ostensible guardians of His Holiness against the Allies, and to listen in on the bargainings of a certain Reverendissimo with the representatives of great American and British papers for the highest price for spot news, to shadow the sleuths in cossacks as well as the baser sort in mufti. All this he did well. And as he possessed the power to make others see what he saw, so Mr. Morgan has been able to make them hear what he heard. To read one of his recorded conversations is to make one feel for the moment to be an eavesdropper. His ambition was to report the news honestly and objectively.

Most of the time the author succeeds in being objective, but there are areas when he seems to be far more subjective. Especially in his development of the theme of his book which is the growing and irresistible power of the papacy. Here personal interpretation is bound to enter in. There are even suggestions of prophecy. The writer seems confident that the See of Peter may sooner or later win over Canterbury and probably the Orthodox Communion. He envisages greatly increased papal prestige with the coming of peace, a strengthening of the Church all over the world, even in Russia, and notably in the United States. In his crystal globe he seems to see the reflection of an American Pope. We wonder if the vision resembles Francis Spellman to whom he devotes many of his pages. In these we

clearly see this high ecclesiastic, "short, buoyant, bespectacled," thoroughly human, courageous, intelligent, devoted. In Rome this man surprised some of his Italian confreres by stunting on the parallel bars, and teaching Roman boys to box, until this dignitary cried out, "Fantastico! Fantastico!", and went away wondering what manner of man this was: Archbishop Spellman of the See of New York, who acted at times as liaison between President Roosevelt and his personal friend, the Pope, who once sent a shipload of American provisions to stock the Vatican larders when the Pope's little city was besieged within its lofty walls, and who is today the chief Chaplain for all American troops in Italy. Is he one of Mr. Morgan's candidates for the greatly increased college of Cardinals he says will follow the war; and does the author see the time coming when he will sit in the Chair of Peter?

Yes, the author of *The Listening Post* has traveled far since he was a Protestant boy on Steubenville's Fifth Street, who suffered martyrdom at the hands of his Catholic schoolboy enemies, whenever there was snow.

ALBERT HALL MARION

District Superintendent, The Methodist Church, New Haven, Connecticut.

The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library. By FREMONT RIDER.
New York: Hadham Press, 1944. pp. xiii-236. \$4.00.

Ever since Solomon observed that "of making books there is no end," the scholars of the world have been hard at work vindicating this assertion. In fact since the invention of printing some five hundred years ago, book making has been progressively accelerating at such a tempo that the not-too-remote generations seem in peril of an engulfing deluge of printer's ink. The most omnivorous scholar in our generation can scarcely hope to keep pace with the annual bibliographies in his own field, for, instead of exhausting a subject, scholarship is constantly discovering two subjects where hitherto there had appeared but one. Hence the publication of books proceeds from generation to generation in geometric progression to the dismay of the student who would master the literature of his field.

But the dismay of the scholar as he contemplates the endless multiplication of books which he can never read is hardly to be compared to the dismay of the librarian as he contemplates the endless multiplication of books which he has no place to house. Anyone who has ever explored the stacks of a great research library and has emerged footsore and intellectually dizzy, begins to realize that there is a rapidly approaching day when something drastic will have to be done in regard to ever-increasing library acreage. When Mr. Rider informs us that research libraries are doubling their holdings on the average of every sixteen years, we begin to see how imminent this day of book saturation actually is. A century of increase will deluge even the most affluent institutions unless some ingenious solution is brought forth to meet this staggering situation.

The research library finds itself in a peculiarly difficult position. Unlike the general library, which may legitimately discard with a free hand large numbers of books, as new and more comprehensive ones supersede them, the research library must preserve all that has gone before and add constantly to it all that comes off the presses in order that the scholar may have access to the entire literature of his field. Nothing is so trivial, so ephemeral, or so worthless that it can safely be discarded with the assurance that some future scholar will never need it. In other words, the research library must preserve all and eliminate nothing.

The librarian of Wesleyan University has looked this problem squarely in the face and has set forth a solution that is as daring as it is novel. The reduction of printed books to the reverse of catalogue cards by microscopic photography is a bit startling to say the least but no more so than the future acreage of stacks which seem to be the alternative. We may not agree that it is as simple to introduce as he would have us think, yet it is doubtful whether anyone has yet been able to bring forth a better scheme.

The future of the research library is as much the concern of the scholar as of the librarian, for in the final analysis it is the scholar for whom the research library exists. This competent and timely discussion of one of the most pressing problems confronting the academic world is well worth reading.

RICHARD D. PIERCE

Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

The Way of Worship. By SCOTT FRANCIS BRENNER. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944. pp. xiii-176. \$2.00.

Doctor Brenner has done well what he has undertaken. His stress is twofold. First, he advocates the use of liturgical forms in Protestant worship. Second, he believes that the liturgical movement, when successful, will lead to the Ecumenical Church. A third emphasis (minor) is Barthian. While he appears to be a disciple of that school, Doctor Brenner would not rule non-Barthians out of the Ecumenical Church. One wonders what he would do with advocates of free worship, which is neither liturgical nor nonliturgical.

The first chapter deals with "The Way of Worship in the Beginning." That points to the Synagogue and the Early Church. The second chapter presents a Barthian conception of "the Word," a conception far from clear. Do not worship the Bible, but do exalt the Bible! One is tempted to ask why. As a minister of the Reformed Church, Doctor Brenner scarcely presents the historic Reformed doctrine concerning the Scriptures.

The third chapter relates to "The Sacraments," with a high view of the Eucharist, which is not to be viewed chiefly as a Sacrifice. The fourth chapter relates to "The Externals," with no place for the central pulpit that has been common among Protestants. The fifth chapter discusses "Disintegration and Recovery." The plea is for thoroughgoing reform, in the light of church history, and not amateur tinkering with homemade programs. Amen!

The treatment throughout is dignified. The author has read widely in the literature that favors the use of fixed forms. Of course, he pays little heed to what such a thinker as Calvin says on the other side. Doctor Brenner has conferred with various scholars who favor the use of liturgy, and with those who advocate modified Barthianism. The style lacks distinction, but still the author writes better than most young ministers today. More than one theological seminary would be strengthened if such a scholar could be added to the teaching staff.

Negatively, the title is too broad. *The Way of Worship* ought to include a discussion of church music. The chapter about the Sacraments ought to have something adequate about baptism. A strong Episcopal bishop says that the New Testament contains more about baptism than about the Lord's Supper. The book now in view seems to be about "Liturgical Worship for the Ecumenical Church." That is long, but then the thesis here is far from simple!

The author should take us back to the real beginning. The book might be a plea for a return to the Old Testament idea of fixed forms. That is where the Roman Church derived the liturgical ideas that undergird Doctor Brenner's book. As for the New Testament, he touches on it lightly. A thoroughgoing study would show that the New Testament knows practically nothing about liturgical forms. It may contain echoes of such music but, if so, it was neither prescribed nor universal. Worship in those days was free. The Church could use forms, or not use them, according to the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

As for church history, the author takes a similar elective course. Everyone knows that the Roman Church and other bodies have long used forms. No one asks that they change their historic ways. But the Reformation would show that the fathers threw off the yoke of bondage to prescribed forms of worship.

In the church of today, also, do the liturgical bodies have a monopoly of missionary and evangelistic zeal? Did not the late B. H. Streeter, a strong Anglican scholar, write that in practice the Prayer Book was disappointing? Does not Bishop Edwin H. Hughes, in his autobiography, *I Was Made a Minister*, strongly protest against the liturgical trend that is weakening the evangelistic fervor of the Wesleyan Church in Britain, if not in the States? In your home community does the strongly liturgical Protestant congregation attract devout worshippers more than the one that has worthy free worship?

Why are masses of our people going over to the cults? Partly because many of the common people do not care for the use of fixed forms. "The Assembly of God," and other movements, nonliturgical, are sweeping sections of our country that once were churchy by people who believed in free worship. Even if all the older denominations did accept Doctor Brenner's "way of worship," we should not have an Ecumenical Church. Hosts of good people would insist on exercising the sort of liberty that the disciples enjoyed in the days when the glory of God crowned the worship of the Apostolic Church. "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free."

ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

Revivalism in America. By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944. pp. xv-192. \$2.00.

Doctor Sweet, the distinguished historian of American Christianity, has rendered a great service to the church in recovering for the reader the social and religious conditions which gave rise to revivalism. If this "ancient good" now has become uncouth, it is because our time has lost sight of the peculiar set of conditions which made revivalism the instrument of a new and creative development of religion in America. No just appraisal of this movement in the American churches is possible apart from the facts and insights of this volume.

The early settlers in America, uprooted from the traditions of the old world, in contact with a wilderness and its savage inhabitants, lost the restraints of morality and religion. In addition the early churches of America were transplanted state churches whose membership was exclusive, upper class, and aristocratic. Their spirit was formal and impersonal, while the frontier developed strong individualistic qualities. Revivalism individualized and personalized religion. Its message was

addressed to the individual need and not to a cause or group. The nature of this appeal is the reason for its emotionalism.

The great revivals reached the unchurched people of the frontier, building in them a sense of personal worth and dignity that underwrote and vitalized democracy. Many of the best-educated leaders led this movement, although they did not approve of some of its excesses. Revivalism flourished particularly among the people of the frontier and among the common people of New England and the Middle Atlantic states. The great revivalist churches were anti-slavery, defenders of the right of freedom in religion, builders of educational and philanthropic institutions.

Revivalism was the Americanization of Protestant Christianity. Under the changed conditions of the New World and life on the frontier, European forms of church life were not effective. While revivalism was marked by excesses, it was the only movement of the American church which proved effective in reaching the unchurched masses. As our life has become urbanized and sophisticated, revivalism has declined in the "respectable" churches. But it is still a potent method for those outside our Gothic churches.

This book is well written and documented, and exhibits discriminating judgment in the use of historical materials. Revivalism as a religious phenomena does not need either defense or attack. It needs to be understood. This book gives in concise form, light for understanding and appraisal of a much-misunderstood aspect of religion in America.

GEORGE N. MAYHEW

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

On Beginning from Within. By DOUGLAS V. STEERE. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943. pp. xvii-149. \$1.50.

Here is a prophetic calling for a "rugged individualism" in the spiritual order. The voice is winsome, persuasive and convincing. Christian ministers and workers, who have become confused and discouraged by the complexities of our modern world order, will find a fresh sense of direction and refreshment of spirit as they listen to this voice that calls us all to "sainthood."

This "rugged individualism" of the spirit is developed by the author from its beginning in wholehearted personal surrender to the personal solicitation of God's spirit, through disciplined training in spiritual exercises, to full maturity in self-forgetful service of one's fellow men. The theme is old. So old we have well-nigh forgotten it. The treatment is new. So new we cannot escape its personal challenge.

The author, in his introduction to the five essays that compose the book, says: "These essays are concerned with the intensification of the life of God in the individual hearts of men. They examine successively the relation of the saint to society, the source of the authority that a saint exercises among his fellows, the nurture of the inward life by a new set of devotional exercises, the debt of theology to devotion, and the prospect of death as an agency of individuation and as a power for awakening man to his dependence upon God."

Lest any one of us shy away from the idea of "sainthood" as a beatific existence possible only to those possessed of religious genius, he insists that an "apostle" or

"saint" is not an apostle by reason of any inherited characteristics either of intelligence, emotion, or abnormal faculty of mystical apprehension. "He is an apostle only as whatever capacities he possesses are wholly open to use for the purposes of God."

Having shown clearly how individuals who have become wholly committed to God have influenced world events, he suggests a series of spiritual exercises which are as helpful now as they have been through the ages in producing a type of Christian character that can change world conditions today.

Without any disparagement of the social gospel and with full appreciation of all that this "collectivist" emphasis has contributed, these essays reaffirm the necessity of personal surrender, personal communion and personal responsibility in convincing fashion. "Doing" is the natural result of "Being," and the order cannot be reversed.

I return to my own work as a pastor, after reading this book, challenged to a deeper personal consecration and more than ever convinced of the power of the "heaven" that one day, please God, shall "leaven the whole."

PAUL W. QUILLIAN

First Methodist Church, Houston, Texas.

Form Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives. By LAURENCE J. MCGINLEY. Woodstock, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1944. pp. viii-165. \$2.75.

In this volume an able Catholic scholar vigorously dissents from the principles, methods and conclusions of Form Criticism. Choosing Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann as the best representatives of that school he pays left-handed tribute to their work as "the flowering of a century and a half of German rationalist criticism." But a greater tribute is implied in the care with which he sets forth their position and in the penetrating analysis to which he subjects their conclusions. He marshals the arguments against them with such thoroughness and cumulative force that his book must be reckoned with in subsequent debate.

The organization of the study follows a lucid and coherent pattern. After an opening chapter that sets forth the rise of Form Criticism and its five fundamental principles, two chapters are devoted to the basic forms of the narrative tradition: the paradigms and apothegms; the novellen and miracle-stories. The next four chapters, which represent the original contribution of McGinley's study, are concerned with testing the Dibelius-Bultmann method of dealing with the healing narratives. The specific test is this: "Do the gospel healing stories so resemble their rabbinic and Hellenic parallels in content, style, and topic, that they must have originated and developed in a similar way and in a similar atmosphere?" The application of the test yields both negative and positive results: the contrasts between the Synoptic narratives and the alleged analogies are so marked that they demonstrate the falsity of the Form Critics' conclusions and the uniqueness of the milieu, motifs and tone of the gospel tradition.

To be sure, the author's starting point predisposes him to this conclusion. He assumes the general historical validity of the gospels as "written by definite authors, in a hierarchical community, at a time when witnesses of the events were still alive." He limits the period of oral communication to a maximum of fifteen years. During this time, the evolution of tradition was guided and guarded by apostles

for whom the biographical and apologetic motifs were primary. The influence of the community was confined to the process of selecting reminiscences; such selection did not extend to the creation of new anecdotes about Jesus. Yet, in spite of these convictions, the author makes significant concessions. He grants the existence of an oral period, the appearance of different forms, and the legitimacy of comparing these forms with those of other cultural traditions; in fact, he welcomes the method as a permanent addition to biblical study.

The value of the book is enhanced by an extensive bibliography; in it, however, there is one strange omission—a superior study of the miracle-stories by Alan Richardson.

PAUL S. MINEAR

Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

The Library of Living Philosophers. Volume V, *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*. Edited by PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1944. pp. xv-815. \$4.00.

This volume, like the others in *The Library of Living Philosophers*, contains many critical essays discussing Russell's philosophy and his own answer to these critics. Names of some of the contributors will reveal that the essays deal with highly abstract and technical problems in areas of philosophy most far removed from the interests of the readers of this journal. Hans Reichenback, Morris Weitz, Kurt Gödel, James Feibleman, Max Black, Philip Weiner, Albert Einstein, Ernest Nagel, A. P. Ushenko have spent their lives dealing with highly technical mathematical and logical problems. On the other hand, such contributors as Boodin, Brightman, Lindeman, Bode, have interests more akin to readers of RELIGION IN LIFE. But a short review treating a volume so large and diversified in content can do no more than select some one item and discuss that only. Therefore I shall limit myself to Russell's account of his own life. In this brief autobiography there is charm and grace, insight and affection, honesty and objectivity. Russell, the man, stands forth.

Both his parents were dead when he had reached the age of three. He was reared by his grandmother who was a very domineering woman. He had scarcely any association with other children. Until he was eighteen, when he went to Cambridge, his education was directed by tutors. He had remarkable skill and great interest in mathematics. He writes: "A great event in my life, at the age of eleven, was the beginning of Euclid. . . . I found great delight in him. Throughout the rest of my boyhood, mathematics absorbed a very large part of my interest." Even after he went to Cambridge he was preoccupied with mathematics above all else for the first three years. Only later did he turn to philosophy. At the end of his philosophical career he writes: "My intellectual journeys have been, in some respects, disappointing. When I was young I hoped to find religious satisfaction in philosophy; even after I had abandoned Hegel, the eternal Platonic world gave me something nonhuman to admire. I thought of mathematics with reverence. . . . Those who attempt to make a religion of humanism, which recognizes nothing greater than man, do not satisfy my emotions. And yet I am unable to believe that, in the world as known, there is anything that I can value outside human beings."

He considers the world as known and described by the sciences as the surest

and most reliable reality that we can know. Yet he undermines this very claim by some illuminating comments about the color red. He suggests that the word "red" might be defined as "those visual sensations which are caused by wave-lengths of such and such a range of frequency." But he notes that if it were so defined nobody could ever have known what red might be prior to discovery of the undulatory theory of light. Yet men have discriminated red and lived with it cognitively, both as color and as word, for untold ages before anyone ever imagined that light was undulatory!

Bertrand Russell never came to know the world of common sense with that deep feeling-sense of its reality that develops in a man who lives from childhood intimately with his fellows, who mixes in the hurly-burly of everyday, who shares deeply and convincingly the thoughts and feelings of common men, who struggles with grubby and stubborn matter-of-fact. His childhood and youth was lived in a library, lived with tutors, separated from other children. As soon as his intellectual abilities awakened, as young as the age of eleven, the chief satisfaction he found in life was to solve the problems and think with the rarefied abstractions of mathematics. No problem ever seemed to him solved, and no fact seemed satisfyingly authentic, until it assumed the clarity and precision and finality of a mathematical proposition. All the rich fullness and all the flood and flow of that experience that throngs upon us seemed less real, less sure, less satisfying, if it could not be put quite completely into mathematical form.

In Bertrand Russell there was a hunger and need. Is there, he asks wistfully, is there something greater than man which commands our reverence, which strikes the soul with awe? Not the starry heavens, he answers, not the massive size of the material universe, not any impersonal nonhuman truth. There is nothing. "And so," he sadly adds, "my intellect goes with the humanists, though my emotions violently rebel. . . . the consolations of philosophy are not for me." The only happiness that he has found in philosophy is happiness derived from achieving a logical analysis that approximates the clarity and precision of mathematics. "In this respect, my philosophic life has been a happy one."

The picture of Bertrand Russell has a significance much greater than portrayal of an interesting personality who shows marks of greatness. It is symptomatic of something that is happening to great numbers of men. As science and mathematics come to dominate our lives and shape our minds more and more, as technology increasingly enables us to select and pick and choose from the massive impingement of common reality those abstractions which happen to please us most, there is a fate awaits us. It is the fate of Bertrand Russell. Man's power to determine what he will see and know and seek and love is the power to blind himself to the subtle and pervasive and most important realities. Perhaps no instrument ever devised can do this more effectively than mathematics and technology.

Mathematics and technology are the supreme tools with which to serve the source of all good and follow in the way of life's enrichment. But if we treat them not as tools, if we allow them to direct the scope and delimit the content of what we see, feel, appreciate, know, personalities of towering greatness thus caught in strange fate will say: "My intellect goes with the humanists, though my emotions rebel." The great mass of little personalities also caught will say: "My intellect goes with the humanists . . . period."

HENRY N. WIEMAN

The Divinity School, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Slavery and Freedom. By NICOLAS BERDYAEV. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944. pp. 271. \$2.75.

There are certain features which make *Slavery and Freedom* an extremely valuable book. For one thing, it begins with a sketch of his intellectual and spiritual pilgrimage, wherein the author frankly confronts the contradiction which runs through his thinking—an aristocratic, well-nigh anarchistic affirmation of personal freedom and creativity *versus* a socialistic defense of the rights and dignity of every man. In the second place, Berdyaev succeeds in setting forth the central theme of his religious and social philosophy without entering into some of the more esoteric views which have proven so baffling to many readers of his *Freedom and the Spirit* and *The Destiny of Man*. Nevertheless, the present volume contains few ideas which have not already been discussed in some fashion in his previous works, and the argument, especially in Part I, is much more repetitious than it need be.

His fundamental thesis is that the source of freedom in the spirit of man transcends all "objectivization" in nature, society and conceptual thought. Hence all philosophies, theologies, ethical norms, political orders and cultural pursuits should be instruments in the service of integral personality. Actually, however, the reverse is the case, and man finds himself everywhere enslaved by the products of his own ambiguous nature. Although Berdyaev calls his point of view "personalist," it should not be confused with Personalism as we know it in America. Moreover, it may be worth pointing out that the "objectivity" which he cavils against is not rational order and dispassionate analysis where these are appropriate, but rather the attempt to solve by logical means evils and conflicts which can only be resolved through spiritual struggle and creativeness.

In Part II, Berdyaev surveys the most general ways in which man finds himself enslaved to determinism or tyranny in connection with: being (e.g. in absolute monism), God, nature, society, civilization and the individual self. In Part III he deals with the more concrete and immediate slaveries of the state, war, nationalism, aristocracy, property, revolution, collectivism, sex and aestheticism. In a brief, concluding section he reaffirms his eschatological faith in the possibility of man's liberation from bondage to fear, death, time and history.

Even a bare list of topics indicates that the author seems to be in revolt against practically everything. The sense in which this is true needs to be understood clearly; for Berdyaev is far too profound a writer to be accused of either petulance or despair. To be sure, his radical spiritual remedy for man's enslavement will not commend itself to hard-headed, pedestrian people since it involves nothing less than liberation from the power of the object world and from everything in the world which tends to make a "thing" of man. And perhaps no one can be blamed for being puzzled, at times, by Berdyaev's strictures; for it is patently impossible to have the kind of freedom he describes without losing most of the advantages of social stability, and it is impossible to implement the principles of justice which he supports without making some of the infringements upon personal liberty against which he protests. Yet such a criticism betrays a failure to comprehend the standpoint from which Berdyaev has attempted to write the book. It is the philosopher's business to view the actual world in the light of the highest vision he can summon, and the author does this without falling into irresponsible Utopianism. His critique is valuable, therefore, not because it points the way to an immediate remedy which is "feasible" in the ordinary sense of the

word, but because it makes us aware of the fatefulness and tragedy of a human situation in which there is no simple way to reconcile freedom with order. For example, his discussion of man's slavery to war, nationalism and property will not enable anyone to remove the influence of these factors; but it will make him more vividly aware of the desperate seriousness of what is happening to him, and by undermining one defensive rationalization after another, it may stir within him a deep longing for a better world and a better life. It is out of such longing and such heightened awareness, Berdyaev believes, that the inner transformation of the human spirit alone can come. In other words, he holds that we cannot alter the objective world significantly except through a change within the persons who encounter that world. Now we meet it in terms of an opposition between mastery and slavery, domination and submission; and each term of the opposition keeps the other alive. True freedom lies altogether beyond this dichotomy.

There is hardly any conceivable point of view in social philosophy which Berdyaev does not reject, precisely because he is struggling to resolve—by existential rather than logical means—the contradictions into which human life falls. In some respects, at least, he is against both sovereignty *and* anarchism, collectivism *and* individualism, the bourgeois spirit *and* revolution. This makes his position a lonely one, as he rather poignantly recognizes. Yet it would be difficult to find a contemporary writer who can lay bare with greater penetration the spiritual confusion which results when egoism is transformed into a virtue by connecting it with the nation or some other "common interest." And it would be difficult to find another book which shows so thoroughly the way all forms of external enslavement reflect an internal enslavement, and thus require a spiritual remedy.

DAVID E. ROBERTS

Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York.

The Leathernecks Come Through. By W. WYETH WILLARD. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1944. pp. 224. \$2.50.

Without taking the edge from the interest of this vital, vivid tale by Lt. Willard of the United States Naval Reserve, it is difficult to tell more than what Lt. Col. Cornelius P. Van Ness of the Marines had to say in his Introduction: "Chaplain Willard, who lived and experienced every moment of the six months that passed between the initial seizure of Guadalcanal and the Tulagi area between August 7 and the withdrawal of the last of the original combat regiments, and the bloody, fast-moving days of Tarawa, has given us a picture of those battles through the eyes of a minister of the gospel.

"As a man new to the service, its customs, traditions and fighting spirit; as a man of peace, unfamiliar with the tragedies, ugliness and corruption of war, he was plunged suddenly into the midst of what is perhaps as violent, as nerve-wracking, and as soul-searing an experience as has been the lot of any man to face. How Chaplain Willard reacted to this new environment, how he adjusted himself to the life that war had imposed on him, and how he accepted the responsibilities of his office are told here in plain words and through the eyes of a man whose utter devotion to his beliefs, whose selflessness and all-consuming desire to serve not only his God, but his country, proved an inspiration, and in many cases salvation, to hundreds of the Marines whose chaplain he was."

The graphic, running style, while rough in some places, makes the actual locale almost materialize for the reader whose name should be Legion.—M. C.-M.

The Doctrine of the Trinity. By LEONARD HODGSON. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944. pp. 237. \$2.50.

In this volume of Croall Lectures at Edinburgh the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford has given us a careful and scholarly book which at the same time is shot through with interest in human beings with concern and affection for them. He never loses sight of the fact that there are people to believe in the Trinity as well as a Trinity in which to believe. This gives his work a flavor as uncommon in books about the nature of God as it is refreshing. When there is added to this virtue Doctor Hodgson's use of plain, simple English words and an entirely homely prose style, the result is a true humanizing of theology. To say this is not to disparage the author's wide reading or his acumen as a philosopher and theologian; nor is it supposed to be a recommendation that these lectures be read by the unlettered; rather it is meant that Doctor Hodgson has made plain how humanly important and how generally interesting the Doctrine of the Trinity can be and is; how not to be ignored as though it were the matter of word-spinning and idea-juggling which many, perhaps most, of those interested in RELIGION IN LIFE are too commonly wont to esteem it. No decent and self-respecting student of religion should fail to look this book over and ponder it, least of all those of a practical trend or those with social interests.

This is not the medium, nor is there space available to me, for a real review of Doctor Hodgson's tracing of the Doctrine from biblical times to now, not even to point out a place or two where he does not quite seem to prove his point, to me at least. The thing that matters most to a practicing Christian and sociologist is his analysis of the nature of real unity, in God and in human lives and in society, which never can be "a mathematical type of unity, characterized by the absence of internal distinctions." It is this more than mathematical conception of unity which makes it true that the Doctrine of the Trinity "gives its character to the distinctively Christian way of worshiping and serving God; that it guides our paths by giving us the pattern unity for individual and social life; that it enables us to see God and man in right proportion." Doctor Hodgson is not, of course, asking us to believe in the Holy Trinity because the doctrine is socially and psychologically utile; but he does indicate that its relevancy will be the more generally perceived if these implications are pointed out.

It does seem odd that the author should persist in calling the American social historian, Harry Elmer Barnes, just "Elmer Barnes," in text and index; and one wonders a bit, too, that Doctor Hodgson should trouble himself to refute Mr. Barnes' theological arguments. No one else has bothered to do so for years now.

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL

Providence, Rhode Island.

The Best Sermons of 1943-44. Edited by G. PAUL BUTLER. New York: Ziff-Davis Publishing Company, 1944. pp. 360. \$3.50.

Preachers, in general, probably know less about the contemporary trends of their art than any other section of the religious population. Occupied, as they are, during the conventional preaching hours they seldom hear one another. Many make it a point not to read the pulpit volumes of other preachers. Sometimes this is because they have tried it, and have found them dull. Many ministers, however, whose natural interest would make them almost gluttonous sermon-tasters, abstain

for fear that unrestrained consumption of another man's sermons might result in unconscious copying of his style or unintentional purloining of his idea.

G. Paul Butler, religious editor of the New York *Mirror*, in this highly selective, yet thoroughly representative collection of today's preaching, has made it possible for the alert homilist to check up on himself without danger of paralyzing his own originality. Both the number of authors and the diversity of their allegiances effectively prevent such a possibility. Thus the present work will be gratefully received not only by the many who are accustomed to enjoy sermonic literature but to the others who ordinarily withhold themselves from it.

What Doctor Butler and his interfaith committee of judges do, in effect, is to lead the reader up the spiral staircase of a cathedral spire to the highest landing, and hand him an X-ray telescope which he may focus successively on the man in the pulpit in 6,146 different chapels, churches and synagogues. In short, the reader is favored with a perfect observation point for a reconnaissance of the entire homiletic field.

Mercifully the judges have spared the reader the enormous task of perusing the six thousand-odd manuscripts which came in response to the editor's invitation. A final fifty-two were singled out for publication by competent and well-known scholars of the respective Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths. Preachers from sixteen states are represented, among them the best-known names of the American pulpit. There are two sermons which arrived via the European underground: one fresh from Denmark, by the Reverend Kaj Munk; and the other from Belgium, by His Eminence, Joseph Ernest Cardinal Van Roey. "God and the Hills of China," is by the Rt. Rev. Andrew Yu-Yue Tsu, Protestant Episcopal Bishop in China. Almost every sermon in the book seems to come from a heart rent by the war and a head dedicated to discovering and declaring the answers to the problems war provokes. This mood is the common denominator of the book.

Since the volume purports to be not an exhibition of typical preaching, but rather *The Best Sermons*, it is entirely possible that it fails by its very excellence, to be a cross-section of today's pulpit product. However, the word of the author and judges that several volumes of almost equal merit could have been assembled from reluctantly discarded manuscripts would indicate that despite pessimists who bewail the pulpit giants of the yesterdays, there are sizable minds dealing magnificently with gigantic themes today.

RALPH STOODY

Director, Methodist Information, New York, New York.

In Quest of a Kingdom. By LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1944. pp. 268. \$2.00.

In Quest of a Kingdom is a popular study of the parables of Jesus, especially those related to the kingdom of God. It is not a work of scholarship such as the studies of A. B. Bruce, Butterick and others who have written standard books in this field. Nevertheless, ministers especially will find it unusually helpful in interpreting these age-old stories of Jesus. The author includes some parables which Bruce classifies other than parables of the kingdom but always he establishes a relationship to this theme which was central in the ministry of our Lord.

The material of the book was used in sermons and week-night addresses at the City Temple and has been recast for publication. In rewriting the subject

matter the author occasionally addresses the reader in a manner reminiscent of the devotional literature of last century: "My dear reader." There are twenty-three chapters with such titles as: "The Sunshine of the Kingdom," "The Kingdom as Joy," "The Creed of the Kingdom," "Christ's Quest For His Own Kingdom." While our social responsibilities are by no means overlooked the tenor of the book is strongly evangelical. In our judgment Mr. Weatherhead's finest insights are revealed in his treatment of the parable of the Prodigal Son. His analysis of the character of the elder brother reveals a deep understanding of the human heart. In this chapter, it may be noted, the author in his commendable zeal to establish the fact of Jesus' condemnation of spiritual sins is led into rather sweeping assertion: "The church has never learned that a proud intolerance, instanced for example by refusing your pew in church to a seeking stranger, is worse in his (Jesus') eyes than adultery. . . ."

In dealing with a story that has baffled the ablest interpreters, the parable of the Unrighteous Steward, Mr. Weatherhead offers the interesting suggestion that in substantially lowering the amount owed by clients to his master the steward was simply canceling his own commission. Otherwise, he points out very properly, his master would not have commended him. The whole point of the parable is that he "looked ahead" as Doctor Moffatt translates it.

The author's knowledge of Palestine and its people's mode of life has greatly assisted him in many points of interpretation. Throughout the book he makes a fine use of a disciplined imagination. *In Quest of a Kingdom* is stimulating, informative and replete with inspiration for minister and layman alike.

JOHN SUTHERLAND BONNELL

The Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, New York.

Lee's Lieutenants. By DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN. Vol. III. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944. pp. 862. \$5.00.

This volume, containing 752 pages of primary text and ninety more pages of appendices and index, and enriched by portraits and maps, brings a great historical work to its conclusion. The first volume covered the period of the American Civil War from the first battle of Manassas to Malvern Hill; the second from Cedar Mountain to Chancellorsville; and now we have the tragic panorama from Gettysburg to Appomattox that ended with the furling of the Confederate flag.

A considerable part of the historical writing of our time has been brilliant, but superficial, with surmise and imagination jauntily used to make a clever story. But in Douglas Freeman American scholarship has produced a historian whose passion for the truth and whose never-tiring search for the ultimate facts give to his work an authority which will be everywhere acknowledged. He is the editor of one of the most important daily newspapers in the South, and he is a citizen of wide and generous interests and activities; yet alongside of these responsibilities he has accomplished, in his *R. E. Lee* and now in this monumental *Lee's Lieutenants*, such an amount of research, not only among generally-known sources but in sources of other minute records which he has collated and sifted, as can be regarded only with admiration and amazement. The general reader will perhaps pass over many of the footnotes by which the pages are fortified, but every reader will have the sense of assurance that he is never being led along paths of careless conjecture but along a road that has been surveyed and proven at every point. Nor will he lose the great prospects by the way; for Doctor Freeman,

together with his devotion to detail, has also the dramatic power to make the immense perspectives of his history appear.

Of the three volumes of *Lee's Lieutenants*, perhaps the second will seem to most readers the most exciting, for through its pages moves the extraordinary figure of Stonewall Jackson, his military genius blazing like a comet until through the last burst of light of his great victory at Chancellorsville he, and the hopes of the Confederacy with him, suddenly plunge into the shadows when he is shot at nightfall by a blind volley from the rifles of his own men. In this last volume there are none among the commanders under Lee who tower so high as Jackson, but even so there is no lack of vivid personalities whom Doctor Freeman has made to pass before the tremendous background of crowded life and heroic death. The description in Chapter XXI of the last fight of Stuart at Yellow Tavern and of what he said and did before he died, and in Chapter XXXIII the passionate lament of one of his friends over the brilliant young Pegram, are passages which lift the details of history into epic poetry. But more powerful than the description of the actions and fates of particular men is the vast and sombre picture of a whole army driven backward little by little in the face of overwhelming pressure toward the darkness of defeat, an army that had known its great hours of brilliant victories now worn down by dreadful losses, hungry, exhausted and stripped of its equipment, yet gallant to the end. The description of the surrender at Appomattox is a passage that all Americans may well read and be proudly thankful that the record on both sides shows so much of magnanimity and courage in our race, and yet remember, too, that as Lee himself once exclaimed, "It is well that war is so terrible, else we might come to love it too much."

The sub-title of *Lee's Lieutenants* is "A Study in Command," and from this point of view one of the most important sections of the whole work is the introduction to this third volume. In it Doctor Freeman sums up what he believes an analysis of the records of the Confederate commanders shows as to the factors which make men successful or unsuccessful as military leaders of men. It is not too much to say that those who determine the personnel of high command in the American armies today may well read these pages with respectful attention. From among paragraphs too long to be quoted here extensively, these few sentences are among the most striking: "Those commanders who shone most in prolonged field operations were, in general, those who had displayed the greatest diligence in keeping their troops disciplined and physically fit while in camp. If a man was a good officer, 'he looked after his men.' That inclusive term covered renewal of clothing and regard for the commissary as surely as the phrase implied knowledge of the art of war and ability to achieve necessary results with minimum losses. A commander who did these things could take demoralized, ill-disciplined troops and bring them to furious fighting pitch."

Altogether this vast book is of course a study of war and of ways of waging it. But still more significantly it is a study of men, and of the qualities in them which make them great or small. After this present war, as after every former one, soldiers must come back to the important task of the reconstruction of life in peace. For such soldiers, and for such a time as that which will lie ahead, there may well be remembered the words which one of Lee's officers spoke to his veterans when the end had come at Appomattox, "Go home, boys, and act like men."

W. RUSSELL BOWIE

Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York.

The Church Must Win. By Charles Tudor Leber. Revell. \$1.75. A plea for an action on the part of the Church, to make itself heard above the upheaval of life today.

Everybody's Calvary. By Alan Walker. Epworth Press. 5s. Since Jesus is ours and we are His, anywhere and everywhere can be "Everybody's Calvary."

The Triumphs of Faith. By G. Campbell Morgan. Revell. \$2.00. A series of lectures based on the great principle of human life, "The just shall live by faith."

Aids to Worship. By Albert W. Palmer. Macmillan. \$2.00. A handbook for public and private devotions, including an overwhelming roster of references.

This Year of Our Lord. By Andrew W. Blackwood. Westminster. \$2.00. A series of sermons for the special occasions which occur during a church year.

Man Does Not Stand Alone. By A. Cressy Morrison. Revell. \$1.25. The work of a scientist who, in dealing with the works of nature, has coupled reason with faith.

Live and Move. By Leonard C. Horwood. Epworth Press. 6s. The logical answer as to what and who are right: "In Him . . . we have our being."

Three Horizons. By Alice Riggs Hunt. Privately printed. \$2.50. Thoughts on opportunity, responsibility and fulfillment in the light of Truth.

The Revolt Against God. By Rufus Washington Weaver. Revell. \$2.50. The conflict between pagan cultures of the New Order, and Christianity.

Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid in Europe. By Visser 't Hooft. American Office of the World Council of Churches. 15¢. Into a 44-page booklet there is compressed both a summary of the predictable tasks of reconstruction of European religious life, and a projection into the future of an ecumenical mission of wide scope and constructive imagination. This pamphlet should be read by all who are concerned about the destiny of European Christianity.

The Way. By J. M. Hartley. Crowell. \$2.50. A novel which points the way to men who are eagerly searching for the nameless leader. The scene is the ancient East and the climax comes with the recognition of the carpenter's son, Yesús.

Stewardship and the World Mission. By John E. Simpson. Revell. \$1.00. Studies in Christian stewardship and the obligation it imposes on the Church to "go ye into all the world."

Christopher Columbus, The Discoverer. By Mattie Johns Utting. Christopher. \$2.00. A "life" that lives, as told as thrilling adventure.

The Christian Mission in Our Day. By Luman J. Shafer. Friendship. \$1.00. A glimpse into postwar missions, through the windows of present-day activity.

Living Education. By T. B. Shepherd. Epworth Press. 6s. Some views on education between the wars and its prospect in the postwar era.

What to Preach. By Henry Sloane Coffin. Harpers. \$1.00. A reprint of the Warrack Lectures for 1926.

The Reed of God. By Caryll Houselander. Sheed and Ward. \$2.00. A fresh and stimulating presentation of the life of Mary, the Mother of Jesus.